

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. XVII

OCTOBER, 1946

No. 10

Mozley's Tribute to Luther

By WM. DALLMANN

James B. Mozley was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford by Gladstone. In January, 1848, he reviewed the enemy Audin's *Luther*, the neutral Michelet's *Luther*, and the friendly archdeacon Hare's "Vindication of Luther," printed in *Essays*, Volume I. These works seem to be the sources of his knowledge of Luther. An Anglo-Catholic, who "has everything but the Pope," he is far from friendly to Luther.

We cull the following:

THE CORRUPTION OF THE CHURCH

If there ever was an age in which the external and working system of the Church was calculated to provoke and excite such a mind to action, it was the age in which Luther lived. It exhibited that peculiar mixture, so poignantly irritating to a keen temper, of the grossest abuses with the most placid and easy self-complacency in those who maintained and were responsible for them. The Court of Rome allowed the lowest fraud and imposture in the working system of the Church and suffered faith and reason to be shocked, itself all the while reposing in a superciliously intellectual, and even rationalizing philosophy. . . . It was rather too much for the Court of Rome to expect of a class of sensitive intellectuals, which were then rising up in the Church, that they were calmly to embrace all the lies of her practical system, while she herself did not believe them and was laughing in her sleeve. . . .

We have the accounts transmitted to us of a Papal Court

which seemed, by some inebriation of the intellect, to have dreamed itself out of Christianity into paganism, ignored by a sort of common consent the Gospel revelation, and instituted again the Groves of Academus. An elegant heathen Pope who carried on Tusculan disputations; cardinals who adorned their walls with scenes from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and devoted themselves to Ciceronian Latin; and a whole scene of luxurious intellectuality in Rome, contrasted bitterly with the palpable superstitions and abuses of the out-of-doors world; and the center of Christendom, putting itself quietly and unconcernedly *ab extra* to a whole system for which it was responsible, while it taught men to despise that system, provoked at the same time disgust and rebellion against its own hypocrisy. . . . The morals of the Roman ecclesiastics were scandalous, and it was only a question whether their vices themselves or the shamelessness with which they indulged them was the worse feature. (Pp. 354—356.)

The profligacy of the ecclesiastics of the Roman Court itself was notorious; and the bishops at large had managed to raise against themselves a strong popular charge of pride and luxury which it is impossible for the fairest reader of history to overlook. (P. 373.)

The sale of indulgences in Germany in the year 1517, conducted by the Dominican monk Tetzel, signally exhibited the impostures and abuses of that system. Coarse, bold, and brazen — there is strong reason for adding immoral — Tetzel carried out the system with a swing and, intent solely on performing his office with practical efficiency, hawked his commodity, in the perfect unconsciousness of vulgar zeal, in churches, public streets, taverns, and alehouses, like a spirited man of business. At a cross set up in the market place, from which the Pope's arms were suspended, the auctioneer extolled the merits of his article, and announced that as soon as ever "the money clinked" in Tetzel's box, sin to that amount was forgiven — the crowd standing about with a mixture of fun and business, as it does in a fair.

LUTHER'S TEACHING

A human soul was absolutely evil and therefore could not, according to any existing method, be justified.

Luther had to find a solution for the difficulty. He found one in the doctrine of imputation. . . . The difficulty of ab-

solute evil on man's part had a complete and triumphant solution in the doctrine of absolute imputation on God's. Quite a new principle in the Christian world.

We are perfectly righteous with the perfect righteousness of Christ. (Pp. 338—340.)

With tremendous energy he inculcates unceasingly this doctrine. It is by faith sole, not by faith perfected in love, that we are justified.

Luther had got his Eureka. He dwelt upon it, now that he had got it, with deep and untiring relish; he handled it and embraced it with perpetual fondness. He felt like a person possessed of a great secret, for which the whole world had been struggling from its creation and never yet attained. He felt as Newton might have felt when he had discovered the principle of gravitation, or as Harvey might have felt when he had discovered the circulation of the blood, or as one of the elder sages might have felt had he discovered the *elixir vitae* or the principle of alchemical transmutation, etc.

He saw the whole world wandering in a maze on this subject, going round and round, and pursuing their own footsteps, etc. He saw a fatal error, affecting the very foundation of the Christian system, in undisturbed possession of the Christian world, and he saw in himself the person destined to subvert it.

He departed wholly from the established type of sermon, quoting, instead of the schoolmen, the Bible, especially Saint Paul's Epistles. (Pp. 350—352.)

"Luther's justification is rejected. His fanatical faith is opposed by the Catholic faith." (Pp. 347, 350.)

Formally and literally stated, the Lutheran dogma of justification by faith is so inconsistent with the first principles of common sense and natural religion that, in their shape, no human being can possibly believe it. It requires us to believe that that which makes a man pleasing to God, or justifies him, has nothing to do with morality or goodness in him; and being moral creatures, we cannot believe this, Luther himself could not believe it, or mean practically to teach it. . . .

If a man is justified, or is in God's favor, without works, then whatever other place or subsequent importance may be assigned to works, he feels tolerably easy about them;

the anxious point is passed, and he can afford to take his leisure. This was the arrangement, then, which the Lutheran dogma of justification made. Not denying all place to good works, Luther deprived them of their conditional place; he took from them all contemporary action in the process of justification and gave them a subsequent one. "I allow," he says, "that good works also are to be inculcated, but in their own time and place, that is to say, when we are out of this capital article of justification." "I too say that faith without works is null and void, but not," he adds, "that faith has its solidity from its works, but only that it is adorned by them. Christians do not become just by doing just things, but being already just, they do just things. . . ."

It allows the mind, reposing upon a justification already past and complete, to proceed to good works as a sort of becoming and decorous appendage of that state. Thus set at ease, the Christian can, if he likes, fall back upon an easier and more casual and secular class of good works; and Luther advises him not to be spiritually ambitious. "There is no such great difference between a good Christian and a good citizen in the matter of works. The works of a Christian are in appearance mean. He does his duty according to his calling: governs the state, rules his house, tills his field, does good to his neighbor." Such appears to be the practical upshot and meaning of Luther's dogma. Not absolutely denying the fundamental truth of natural religion that man should do good works (Pp. 434—437.)

The Gospel language was only a pious fraud. (P. 394.)

Luther's sermon on matrimony in 1522 gives license from which the natural conscience of a heathen and a savage would recoil. (P. 401.)

Of course the don never read the beautiful sermon but lifted his vicious slander from the French Catholic Audin, whom he himself calls "an enemy" of Luther.

THE THESES

On October 31, 1517, Luther fastened on the church doors ninety-five theses against these indulgences . . . and alarmed the old and awakened the new intellect in the Church. (P. 353.)

Luther now stood before the world as a Reformer.

Tetzel erected a scaffold in one of the promenades of Frankfort, walked in procession to it with his insignia as Inquisitor of the faith, preached a sermon, ordered the heretic to be brought forward for punishment, placed the theses on the scaffold, and burned them.

Rome was destined to find its match.

CAJETAN

Luther said: "Christ has *acquired* a treasure by His merits; the merits, therefore, are not the treasure." Cajetan had committed a mistake, and did not regain his position.

The issue of the conference was a disappointment at Rome; the fault was thrown upon Cajetan's stiffness and asperity. (Pp. 361, 362.)

ECK

The great disputation at Leipzig brought together all the young theologians of Germany, and Luther did immense execution. Pitted, greatly to his advantage, against the sharpest, noisiest, most vain, impudent, and unscrupulous disputant of the age, he won at one morning many of the subsequent lights of the Reformation. (P. 369.)

KAISER KARL V

Luther appeared more as a conqueror than a criminal; the very scene which was intended to suppress him was his greatest elevation, and his condemnation established him in the position of a successful and recognized reformer. (P. 370.)

THE REFORMER

Luther was primarily a doctrinal reformer. (P. 351.)

Luther had a completely new ground, both doctrinal and ecclesiastical, to make; he had a new doctrine, the Lutheran dogma of justification by faith, to propagate and transmit to posterity; he had a new society to form, which was to be the keeper and transmitter of it. It was absolutely necessary to construct a whole new system, internal and external, doctrinal and corporate; that is to say, a new Church. (P. 382.) The great doctrine he had to promulgate created his own Church, and sanctioned its own priesthood and sacraments. . . . The new Lutheran Church rose up because the Lutheran doctrine wanted it, and appealed to no other sanction or right. (P. 383.)

SENSIBLE

An easy, capacious liberalism objected to the dogmatic enforcement of fasts and feasts, vestments, images, and the like, but so long as they were left voluntary saw no harm in them. Dogmatism in rejecting and dogmatism in enforcing were both condemned. (P. 386.)

JOVIAL

Luther always exerted the powers of Comus towards his adversaries.

Their human countenance,
The express resemblance of the gods is changed
Into some brutish form of wolf or bear,
Or ounce, or tiger, hog, or bearded goat. (P. 377.)

His popular winning character. . . . The sweetness and fascination which mingled with the power of his character. (P. 368.)

Popular leader and mover of masses. . . . He had obvious weight and solidity; he had the stamp of practical power upon him. (P. 369.) A bold original mind. (P. 371.)

Luther could not have done what he did if he had not been constitutionally endowed with powers of action in the most wonderful degree, and to possess these powers was to possess a never-failing stimulus to temper. (P. 379.)

Luther's was a powerfully and strikingly religious mind. Whether his religion was a true one or not, he had one; he lived for its sake; he was full of it; it inspired, strengthened, and stimulated him and made him what he was. He stood before men like a being from another world, possessed of an intensity of religious belief and ardor to which ordinary men had nothing comparable, and which the world gazed upon as it does upon any transcendental phenomenon. Out of the whole ecclesiastical corps of the day not a man was to be found who could meet him on this ground. Everybody knows the great weight and influence of "signs" in the religious department; people have always sought after signs and always will. . . .

Luther was a striking phenomenon of the religious class, an instance of a man possessing and communicating the most powerful religious convictions. The religious reason thus came in, and Luther gained numbers on the ground that he seemed to have earnestness on his side, while the Church was

worldly and secular. A marvelous combination of the worldly politician and deep religious enthusiast, Luther was confronted by the talent and tact of commonplace men, and he rode over it easily and triumphantly. Legate after legate and diet after diet broke down before him; they could do nothing; he had all his own way. He succeeded for the plain reason that there was not in the whole of Christendom his match, and that the greater man, like the greater momentum, naturally prevails. What indeed must have been the prostration of the Church when, in the person of Pope Adrian, she humbly and almost on her knees implored Erasmus for help against Luther; and the lukewarm indifferentist refused with the remark "I told you what was coming." (Pp. 374—375.)

Luther had enormous activities, and had that strong passion which goes along with them, and he was lifted by himself, in connection with events, into a position which demanded the constant support which the whole strength of his nature could give. He had a whole cause to push, maintain, and support — a whole world to oppose. His strength carried him through his work. (P. 381.) The whole world pestered him with questions, he said.

The magnanimous ease and repose of the great leader of the movement stands out strikingly amid the petty scruples and small activities of the inferior agents, and Luther submits to all these questionings with that half-kind, half-scornful condescension which dignified persons submit to any bore which their position brings upon them. (P. 386.)

This dogma of justification has unquestionably had an important and influential career, and Luther has succeeded in impressing an idea very deeply and fixedly upon a theological posterity. It covers all Protestant Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway; it has always had, and has now, a considerable reception within our own Church. Its effects are too apparent. . . .

Our divines as a body have indeed done their duty with respect to this idea, and have exposed its onesidedness and hollowness, its opposition to Scripture and reason, and they have prevented English Lutheranism, though it has gained extensive influence, from getting predominance. [Bishop Bull.] But the Lutheran dogma goes on, being the comfort and stay, the one Christian creed, the one religion of many minds.

... We see the facts before us, and must be mainly content with them. (P. 347.)

The Lutheran Adam is a superior creation to the Calvinistic Adam of Milton. (P. 345.)

Luther was the original discoverer of that set of ideas which Calvin only compacted and systematized. (P. 350.)

Luther was a great man, the great author of the Reformation. (Pp. 410—411.)

Yes, and Luther's "fanatical" and immoral teaching freed this Oxford don himself from the tyranny of the corrupt Pope. Oak Park, Ill.

The Slavonic Luther

By ANDREW WANTULA *

I

Where the largest and mightiest Polish River, the Vistula, rises, lies a small country known as Cieszyn Silesia (Teschen Silesia). After the last World War two Slavonic sister nations, Poland and Czechoslovakia, shared this land between them. To a large extent the river Olza formed a natural boundary between these two nations, and the old capital, the city of Cieszyn, was divided between them. From 1290 until 1653 this country was an independent dukedom. The rulers were the Dukes of Sieszyn of the Royal House of the Piasts. After the death of the last duchess of Sieszyn, Elizabeth Lucretia, who left no successor, the land was incorporated into the Hapsburg Monarchy and remained under that rule until the year 1918.

It is not generally known among Evangelical people outside Europe that in spite of everything the Lutherans of Polish descent maintained themselves there, deeply conscious of their past and equally enthusiastically attached to their faith. They numbered over 100,000 souls. In addition, there were also Lutherans of German descent.

Prior to World War II these Lutherans were organized in seventeen parishes and formed the Diocese of Silesia. It belonged to the Evangelical Augsburg Consistory in Warsaw.

* Dr. Wantula is pastor of the Polish Lutheran parish, London, England. — ED. NOTE.

It is worthy of note that shortly before the war, when the Lutheran Church in Poland became a focal point of nationalistic quarrels, mutual understanding and peace ruled between the Lutherans of both Polish and German descent in the Diocese of Silesia.

How does it happen that Lutherans of pure Polish descent remain in this small country even to the present day? How can we account for this fact, and how was it that they were not destroyed in the savage Counter Reformation, which lasted for about two centuries? Why have they not been submerged in the surrounding sea of Roman Catholicism first in Austria and then in Poland? To give satisfactory answers to these questions, it would be necessary to describe the events of the history of the Reformation in that province, an impossible task in an article of this nature. But as a brief indication of these developments two facts of major importance in Evangelical history may be pointed out. The first of these is that in the sixteenth century the doctrine of the Reformation was accepted in Cieszyn Silesia not only by the duke and townspeople but by the peasantry as well. When the duke returned to the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church in 1610, the townspeople succumbed with their superiors and under persecution from them, but the peasant folk, miraculously steeled and upheld by their faith, kept true to the cause to which they had given their hearts, and nothing could change their steadfastness in spite of the most terrible suffering.

In the first half of the eighteenth century the Jesuit L. Tempes tried unceasingly and by every possible means to convert the Evangelicals to Roman Catholicism, but without success. An entry in his diary describes his dealings with "stiffnecked heretics" (*"durae cervicis heretici"*). Even today there is a proverb in Silesia, "Stubborn as the Lutheran faith around Cieszyn," describing the firmness and conviction of these folk.

A second fact to be remembered is the influence of the Evangelical religious literature. It is worth while mentioning here three books which helped immeasurably in preserving the faith of the Evangelical Augsburg Church in Cieszyn Silesia. These are the Bible in the Polish language, a book of family sermons by the Rev. Samuel Dambrowski, 1625, and the church hymnary of the Rev. George Trzanowski, 1636.

The Evangelical people of Silesia were intensely devoted to these books and relied upon them as their only true friends in times of oppression, friends who never let them down and became their closest companions in times of distress.

The stability and preservation of the Evangelical character of Cieszyn Silesia is due to the untiring efforts and devotion of the Rev. G. Trzanowski, who rightly deserves to be known, as he was later called, as "The Slavonic Luther."

II

Who was this man who played such an important part, not only in the Lutheran Church in Cieszyn Silesia but also in Moravia, Bohemia, and Slovakia?

He was born in Cieszyn on March 27, 1592. His father lived in Trzanowice, a small village near Cieszyn. For many generations his ancestors had lived in the same village, hence his family name. In his autobiography, *Coronis ad posteritatem*, he speaks of his great-grandfather Adam, burgomaster and sheriff in Trzanowice, who, he says, lived 103 years. When quite an old man, he could be heard singing sacred songs, accompanied by the lute. This old man made a deep and lasting impression upon young Trzanowski, who praises him in his autobiography. He prayed to God, not for a long life, but for a life supported by real faith in God, such as his great-grandfather had had.

Trzanowski began his studies in Cieszyn. But soon, taking with him many deep and lasting impressions, he left his Cieszyn surroundings for life at a secondary school, or lyceum, in Guben, Saxony, afterwards going on to Kolberg, Pomerania, where he remained for three years. After matriculation he spent five years at the University of Wittenberg. Here he came under strong Lutheran influences, which had a great and significant effect upon his theological and religious outlook.

His first position after graduation was as a teacher at the Church of St. Nicholas in Prague.

Today it is difficult to imagine the reason for his going to Prague. Why did he not take up a position in Silesia? Perhaps he went there owing to the toleration which the Evangelicals at that time, 1611, enjoyed in Bohemia on the basis of the Act of Toleration of His Majesty the Emperor

Rudolph II, 1609, or he may have been influenced by the fact that the duke of Cieszyn, Adam Wenceslas, forsook the Reformation camp in 1610 and made war against the Evangelicals, or perhaps he was greatly influenced by his friendship with his Bohemian fellow students in the University of Wittenberg.

Suffice it to say that he started his life's work in Prague. Yet he soon became convinced that Prague was not to be the scene of his activity. Before long he realized that amongst the Bohemian Evangelicals there were quarrels and theological disputes. Its Lutheranism was threatened by the Calvinist and the Bohemian Brethren movements.

Trzanowski had been brought up in the spirit of pure Lutheranism, and he was not content to stay in an area of such spiritual storms. Therefore he left Prague after six months and accepted a position as tutor in the home of a member of the Bohemian nobility, where he remained for a whole year. From there he went to Holesov in Moravia, where he held a position as headmaster of a school.

In the year 1615 we meet him again in yet another position as leader of the school at Valasske Mezrici, also in Moravia. Here he takes an important step with regard to his future life, as he is ordained and becomes a pastor in Valasske Mezrici. The ordination took place at Oels in Silesia on April 21 in the year 1616.

As the parish minister of Valasske Mezrici he worked quietly for a few years, and it might have been presumed that here he would end his days. Not so, however. Circumstances beyond his control altered his way of life. In 1618 the Thirty Years' War broke out. After the Battle of the White Mountain, Bila Hora, the victorious imperial armies (Roman Catholics) entered Moravia and captured Mezrici. Trzanowski left his position and, together with his family (he had married in 1615), took shelter at his birthplace, Cieszyn. Not for long did he stay there but returned to Mezrici, where he was imprisoned. After a short time he was released. He now came upon very hard times. Moravia was stricken with a terrible plague. It ravaged the people of Valasske Mezrici, and about two thousand of his parishioners, including two of his sons and a daughter, succumbed. Still Trzanowski remained at his post through this most difficult and terrible time.

His career at Valasske Mezrici ended through a royal imperial mandate in 1624, when the Evangelical clergy were commanded to leave the country of Moravia and the people were instructed to return to the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church within a period of six weeks.

Trzanowski postponed his departure as long as possible, but eventually was compelled to say farewell to his congregation in 1625.

Once more he returned to Cieszyn and from there went to Bielsko, where he found shelter in the castle of Baron John Sunegh. Here he resided until the end of 1627, occupying positions first as court chaplain and later as municipal minister.

The Counter Reformation wave overflowed the lands of the Hapsburgs and forced Trzanowski to leave Bielsko. The Sunegh family took him into the castle of Budatyn, Slovakia, and afterwards Illeshazy into the castle of Orava.

Here he remained for three years, until 1631, when he was called by the congregation at Liptovsky Svaty Mikulas in Slovakia to become its pastor. There he stayed until his death, which came after a long illness on May 29, 1637.

He was quite young when he died, being only forty-six. He was buried in the Church of Svaty Mikulas (St. Nicholas), which now belongs to the Roman Catholic Church. The site of his resting place has not been preserved.

III

Trzanowski was called the "Slavonic Luther." Incidentally the Slovaks called him the Polish Luther because of his Polish descent. The first appellation appears to be the more correct one. Trzanowski belongs, because of his literary work and through the creative activities which he developed, to all the Slavonic-speaking people of the Evangelical faith, whether they live in Bohemia, Slovakia, Silesia, Hungary, America, or elsewhere.

His cradle stood among the Poles; the way of life led him through Prague to Moravia, Cieszyn, and Bielitz, and his ashes rest among the Slovaks. The sound of his lute was heard through the centuries among people living where his feet had trod. Through his creative activities he served all alike, and all the Slavonic Evangelicals owe him a great debt of gratitude. A Slavonic bard! Indeed, a bard above all, and

on this bardic activity his whole importance is based. It was best expressed in the designation the Slavonic Luther.

That he was a loyal, staunch Lutheran he immediately made known to wider circles by his first book, published in Olomuniec in 1620. It was a Czech translation of the Augsburg Confession. Trzanowski appears here as an ardent defender of Augustana principles and gives expression to them in a long foreword with which he introduced the translation. The reason why he decided to make a new translation of this confession was the shortage of previous translations and the inadequacy of those that did exist. At the same time he was also influenced by the religious circumstances prevailing at that time in Bohemia and by the desire to oppose the concessions made on the part of the Lutherans to the Calvinist cause and the Bohemian Brethren. He regards the Augsburg Confession as a "precious jewel," a divine gift in which God compressed His truth. This truth of God should not be put under a bushel but on a candlestick. Trzanowski devotes a considerable part of his foreword to the defense of the Augsburg Confession against different charges. It ought to be added that the above translation was and still is considered excellent. Trzanowski dedicated his work to the burgomaster (mayor) and the city council of Cieszyn.

Trzanowski's rigorous Lutheran attitude finds its expression in his whole further literary activity, but it was especially emphasized in a collection of Latin hymns and odes published in Brzeg, Silesia, in 1629 under the title *Odorum sacrarum sive hymnorum libri tres*. This collection contains 150 hymns and odes, a discussion on Christian "paganism," and remarks on the subject of versification. Trzanowski also added music to the collection, wishing to point out that his odes could be used for singing.

The Latin odes made the name of Trzanowski known and ensured his fame as a bard. Through them he took his place in the sphere of devout Latin post-Humanistic creativeness. He may be placed beside the poet and Wittenberg professor of poetry Fr. Taubmann (1565—1613), whom Trzanowski had met during his stay at the Wittenberg University. He was dependent on him for forms and topics.

To his point of view Trzanowski gave decisive expression in the previously mentioned discussion "*De Christiano-gen-*

tilismo." In it Trzanowski reproaches some of the poets, who, like the Jews, turned their backs on God and bowed down to idols. Of such are the poets who in their songs call upon the pagan idols, such as Jupiter, Apollo, the Muses, as well as on God. This kind of writing had already been condemned by the Apostle Paul and Luther, who called upon men to give praise only to the one true God. Christian poets ought to deal only with Christian history, Biblical history, and not with pagan themes. Trzanowski does not allow the use of pagan metaphors, such as inferno, Mars, meaning battle, and so on.

The most characteristic production of Trzanowski, showing him most clearly as a literary creator, is his principal life work—his hymn book, entitled *Cithara Sanctorum*, published in 1636 in Lewocza by Brewer.

This hymnbook was generally accepted by the Lutheran congregations in Slovakia, Bohemia, and Cieszyn Silesia and exercised a tremendous influence on the people who used it for several centuries. It is enough to say that there have been up to the present time about 150 different editions. It rarely happened that a new edition was an unchanged version of the earlier one. New hymns were continually added. One of them contained as many as 1,151 hymns, while the first edition had only 412. During the religious persecutions the hymnbook was printed in Germany. In 1919 the first American edition was published, and more recently one was brought out in 1928 in Pittsburgh. Indeed, this hymnal is used to this day by the Slovak Lutherans in the United States, Canada, and South America. It is estimated that at present this hymnbook is used all over the world in 365 congregations, embracing about 400,000 souls. It is not now generally used in Silesia, but the older generation still uses it in home services.

The language in which the songs are written is Bohemian, understandable alike to Czechs, Slovaks, and Polish Silesian Lutherans. This assertion, not understood perhaps at first, becomes clear, however, when one takes into consideration the political conditions prevailing in those countries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. We may pass over this point, as it is of very little importance for us. What is important is that, as the above figures show, Trzanowski's hymn-

book has not yet finished the blessed work which it has been doing for 300 years. It is to this day what it was for centuries — a living book.

As previously stated, the first edition of his hymnbook contained 412 hymns. In this number there are about 100 of his own and about 69 translations made by Trzanowski himself. The rest are reprints from former hymnbooks and various collections of hymns, being either original Czech and Slovak or versions of German and Latin hymns.

Trzanowski divided his hymnbook into three parts. In the first part he put the hymns for the high festivals of the ecclesiastical year, then hymns for Sundays from Advent to Trinity Sunday. In the second part he put the hymns on the subjects of confession of faith, Holy Communion, Apostles, marriage and funeral hymns, and in the third one are found the hymns about the Church, prayer, Baptism, principal articles of the Christian faith, hymns and Psalms of repentance, morning and evening hymns, hymns before and after meals, hymns about the last things, and finally Psalms for vespers.

The greater part of Trzanowski's hymns is characterized by religious objectivity, resulting from the desire to express the faith not so much of an individual as of the entire Church. He thus became the protagonist of religious truths, which cannot be attained by one's own effort, but which have been revealed to mankind by our Lord Jesus. As a poet he was first of all an advocate of God's revelation, but not at all of the experiences and feelings of an individual. This characteristic feature of his poetic activity appeared very clearly in the greater part of his hymns. He wanted not only to comfort but also to teach in his songs. He therefore expressed in them always as clearly as possible the principles of the Christian faith; he preached the Gospel, the truths of divine revelation. From his hymnbook, and even from his own hymns alone, one could reproduce the Biblical stories and the teachings contained in the Holy Scripture, beginning with the creation of the world and the life in Paradise and finishing with the account of the Last Day.

In order to be able to appreciate to the full extent the character of this influence, one must exactly realize Trzanowski's spiritual qualities. Trzanowski's whole production bears the mark of an outstanding denominational enthusiasm.

In all his work he expressed his religious thoughts in Luther's fashion. His personal views and his faith were always in complete agreement with the official creed of his Church. He found no difficulty in believing that which his teachers — the great reformers — confessed and what the Evangelical Church proclaimed, for their faith was truly his most personal belief. The Church's dogmas were the most perfect expression of his own faith. Wishing to express his belief, he most willingly adhered to them. One might therefore have the impression that his whole literary production bears the marks of some dogmatism, perhaps some dryness. In this very dryness and severity, however, is hidden the strength of his works, especially of his hymns and his hymnbook. His whole production is as uniform as if forged out of one mass. From each verse radiates a deep unshakable belief in the truth which he proclaims. Everyone who gets to know Trzanowski through his works realizes with full certainty with whom he is dealing, what is his belief, and what the truth of God is that he announces. His poetic production does not perhaps appeal so much to the emotions; yet it grips the soul by its power of conviction and faith. He preaches indefatigably that basic truth of God confessed by the Lutheran Church, the truth of man's reconciliation to God effected by Christ and proclaimed in the Gospel; he stands for this truth with the whole of his conviction and thus conquers hearts for it. By his rigorously religious attitude, by his Lutheranism with all its implications, he molds and wins the souls and minds of the people. The man who has been once won for the truths which he proclaims knows very well what kind of truth it is and what demands it makes on him. Trzanowski first of all appeals to the intellect and persuades, then gets hold of hearts and masters them. The emotional reasons come only after the intellectual ones.

Could you, therefore, be surprised that in all the religious disturbances, the people of his homeland, using this hymnal, did not deny their faith, but resisted, also during the present war, the antireligious propaganda and all the Nazi attempts of separating them from their Church? When in 1940 the Polish Lutheran pastors were arrested and the Polish language banned from the pulpit, the mothers and fathers gathered their children and their servants round the

family tables and conducted home services, thus holding to the faith of their forefathers. Indeed Trzanowski's spirit has remained alive among these people up to the present day. His literary heritage, in the original and in translations, continues to act here as a leaven and confirms the simple peasant folk in faith.

The Slavonic Luther has not yet been silenced among the Slavonic people. This indeed is the hope for the future.
London, England

Noah's Curse and Blessing Gen. 9:18-27*

By J. ERNEST SHUFELT

This paper has been prepared with particular reference to the modern implications of Noah's curse upon Canaan. With this purpose in mind a rather critical study of the verses noted above has been undertaken. The following notes and conclusions are the result of this study.

Verse 18 begins, "And the sons of Noah, that went forth of the ark, were Shem and Ham and Japheth." These three sons are mentioned together six times in the Bible (Gen. 5:32; 6:10; 7:13; 9:18; 10:1; 1 Chron. 1:4), and always in the same order. This would seem, then, to be the order of their ages: Shem being the first-born, Ham next, and Japheth the youngest.

However, in Gen. 10:21 we read, "Unto Shem also . . . the brother of Japheth the elder, even to him were children born." Now, if this translation is correct, then we must consider Japheth the elder brother of Shem. But going into this matter just a little further, we seem to find good grounds for questioning the correctness of the translation. The Hebrew word *gadol*, here translated "elder," literally means "great." When applied to persons, it means the elder (of two) or the eldest. But some Hebrew scholars tell us that it is correct Hebrew usage to treat this word, not as a modifier of the possessive Japheth, but as a modifier of the whole expression

* This paper takes issue with the exegesis of Gen. 9:18-27 current in our circles. Several brethren who are competent scholars agree with the essayist. Let the paper be given the impartial, objective consideration to which it is entitled. — Ed.

"brother of Japheth." On the basis of this criticism the verse would read, "Shem, the elder brother of Japheth," instead of "Shem, the brother of Japheth the elder." And this would tend to verify the order of ages suggested above. (See Leupold's *Exposition of Genesis*, page 375.)

Verse 18 continues: "and Ham is the father of Canaan." This is the first time the name Canaan occurs in Genesis, and it introduces him also as a character in the story that is being told. It tells his relationship to Ham and, by inference, his relationship to Noah.

Verse 19 reads: "These are the three sons of Noah; and of them was the whole earth overspread." This simply tells us that Noah had only these three sons of his own and that they were the fathers of the whole human race.

Verses 20-21a read: "And Noah began to be a husbandman, and he planted a vineyard. And he drank the wine and was drunken." This is Scripture's first reference to a vineyard and wine and drunkenness. Scripture speaks of wine as one of God's gifts to men (Ps. 104:15) but also warns against its use whenever temptations and excesses are involved (Prov. 9:2, 5; 23:30-31 *et al.*); and it condemns drunkenness as a soul-destroying work of the flesh (1 Cor. 6:10; Gal. 5:21). And yet it should be said in extenuation of Noah's guilt, in this instance, that he may not have known the intoxicating effect of wine prior to this experience. Moreover, there is not the slightest hint that Noah was ever drunk again.

But even drunkenness that is the result of ignorance and innocence may and sometimes does lead to other very shameful sins. Verse 21 continues, "And he was uncovered within his tent." This shameful exposure of his person was disgustingly vile. It is in full keeping with the Eighth Commandment, however, to presume that this sin was committed unintentionally so far as Noah was concerned; for Scripture tells us that Noah was a God-fearing man, who "became an heir of the righteousness that is by faith" (Heb. 11:7).

Verse 22 reads, "And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father and told his two brethren without." We notice a tendency here to read into the text more than it says. The Eighth Commandment demands that we "put the best construction on everything" also here. Let us

note, then, that Ham saw his father's nakedness, but under what circumstances the text does not say. Was it accidental and without previous knowledge? Or had he learned of his father's condition from another, for instance, Canaan, and gone to verify what he had heard? The text simply says that Ham saw the nakedness of his father and told his two brothers without. The fact that he himself did not cover his father's shame and hide the secret of it in his own heart suggests a breaking of the Fourth, and perhaps also of the Sixth, Commandment, but here, too, we should exercise charity in judgment.

Verse 23, however, sets the conduct of Ham's two brothers in sharp contrast to Ham's: "And Shem and Japheth took a garment and laid it upon both their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakedness of their father; and they went backward, and they saw not the nakedness of their father." We shall note the implications of this contrast in commenting on Noah's blessing (vv. 26-27).

Verse 24 reads, "And Noah awoke from his wine and knew what his younger son had done unto him." This "younger son" is commonly understood to be Ham, the second son of Noah; but there are at least two considerations that militate against the correctness of this understanding.

In the first place, the Hebrew word *qatan*, here translated "younger," literally means "little, small, insignificant"; and when used in reference to persons, it is always used of the least, the youngest of the group, except here. When used of the two sons of Isaac and Rebecca, it is applied to Jacob and properly translated "younger" (Gen. 27:15, 42). It is similarly used of Rachel, the younger of the two daughters of Laban (Gen. 29:16, 18). But when used of the twelve sons of Jacob, it is used only of Benjamin, the youngest (Gen. 42:13 *et al.*). The same may be said of the eight sons of Jesse. Only in reference to David, the youngest, is this word used (1 Sam. 16:11; 17:14). Now, if the same rule is to be applied to the passage before us, the translation "younger" must be ruled out; for there are more than two sons in the picture. And its application to Ham must be ruled out, too; for Ham was the middle son, not the youngest. Efforts to make it appear that Ham is the youngest son have been made, but they are certainly not conclusive.

In the second place, verse 24 says that Noah "knew what his 'younger' son had done unto him." Something dishonorable was done to Noah while he lay drunk within his tent, something so vile that it called forth a curse—not simply the curse of a man, but as we believe on account of Noah's relation to Jehovah, the curse of God. Moreover, verse 22 says of Ham that he "saw the nakedness of his father and told his two brethren without." This is the part that Ham took in this narrative. But it does not even suggest that Ham did anything to his father; for seeing him and telling others about it, is not doing anything unto him.

We must conclude, then, that verse 24 makes no reference to Ham; for Ham was not Noah's youngest son (the little one). Neither was he the one of whom it was said that Noah "knew what his 'younger' son had done unto him." And verse 23 precludes the possibility that the reference is to Japheth, the youngest of the three sons of Noah. Who then was this youngest son of whom we read that Noah knew what he had done unto him?

Let us note that the Hebrew word *ben*, translated "son," is also properly used of grandson. (Note, for instance, Gen. 29:5, and compare it with Gen. 24:47 and 28:5.) Noah was the patriarch, and his sons included his sons' sons. And we noted in verse 18 that Canaan, the youngest son of Ham (Gen. 10:6), was also introduced as a character in this story. He may also be called, according to Hebrew usage, the youngest son of Noah. And this understanding is further supported by the continuity of thought when we read verse 24 and 25 together: "And Noah awoke from his wine and knew what his younger (rather, youngest) son (literally, "his son, the little one") had done unto him. And he said, 'Cursed be Canaan.'" It was Canaan who did something dishonorable, something vile to Noah. What it was, we are not told, unless it be disclosed in the statement concerning Noah (verse 21) "and he was uncovered within his tent." But this much is certain: when Noah awoke from his wine, he knew what was done and who did it. "And he said, 'Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.'"

"And he said (verses 26 and 27; following the marginal readings): "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be servant to them. God shall persuade Japheth, and

he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be servant to them." Praise is to the Lord, the Lord God of Shem, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. The praise was not upon all the descendants of Shem; for most of them turned from the true God to join the nations, the Gentile nations of the world. Shem lived to see his descendants to the ninth generation and died when Abraham was a mature man. The knowledge and fellowship of the true God was undoubtedly transmitted to Abraham through Shem. And it was soon after the death of Shem that God called Abraham to go out from his home and from his father's house into a strange land, and there He promised to bless him and make him a blessing to all nations.

The land in which Abraham sojourned was the Land of Canaan. God promised this land to Abraham and to his seed. But he did not fulfill this promise until many years later, when Canaan's cup of iniquity was full. It was nearly a thousand years after the pronouncing of the curse upon Canaan, before the promise was fulfilled in respect to the Israelites, the descendants of Shem.

"God shall enlarge (the marginal reading is "persuade") Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem." The Hebrew word here translated "enlarge" is more often translated "persuade." When the word "enlarge" is used, it suggests material blessings; while the word "persuade" suggests spiritual blessings. And while the children of Japheth have enjoyed great material prosperity and influence, it is nearer the truth to consider those blessings as by-products of the great spiritual leadership that came to the Japhetic people than to reverse the emphasis. The Japhethites, too, early joined the Gentile nations that departed from the true God. But beginning with the New Testament era, God the Holy Ghost persuaded very many of them to dwell in the tents of Shem, the tabernacles of the true Israel, the Christian Church.

"And Canaan shall be servant unto them." Just how and when and where this was fulfilled in respect to Japheth is not so certain; for it is not recorded in Scripture. But one thing is certain: There is no justification for the teaching that it was fulfilled in the enslavement of African Negroes during the four or five centuries recently past; for there is no ground

for saying that the Canaanites ever settled in Africa, except possibly the Phoenicians who settled Carthage and were conquered by the Romans.

Only Shem and Japheth are mentioned in Noah's blessing; and it came to them as a reward for the high esteem in which they held their father as shown by their deed of covering their father's shame without permitting themselves to look upon it. They received the promise of the Fourth Commandment. Ham was careless in this matter, and he was not included in the blessing. But this does not justify the position that Ham was cursed. Neither Ham nor his three older sons were cursed. They and their descendants also joined the nations that forsook the true God. But they are comforted, too, by the promise of the Psalmist: "Princes shall come out of Egypt; Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands unto God" (Ps. 68:31).

We must conclude, then, that no one is justified in teaching that the curse upon Canaan is a curse upon Ham and his African descendants, or that "history has marked the African races as the descendants of Canaan" (*On Sandals of Peace*, page 7).

High Point, N. C.

The Communist Manifesto*

By PAUL M. BRETSCHER

In June of this year, Jacques Duclos, secretary of the Communist party of France, wrote the following:

In a general fashion, the war with which the world has just been afflicted has led to profound disturbances in our ancient Europe. The ruling classes which appeared in the past as highly — not to say exclusively — representative of national feeling presented the sad spectacle of a group defending their selfish class interests and betraying, in the main, the cause of their country.

On the other hand, it was in the working class that those patriotic and progressive traditions were found which, at the great moments of history, are always expressed by the rising class in society.

In this way, the brilliant prediction of Marx, in his immortal "*Communist Manifesto*" of 1848, was proved to be true. After

* This essay was read and discussed in a small study group. It is here submitted in the hope that, in view of present-day trends and debates, our readers will welcome the historical material it contains. — Ed.

pointing out that the proletarians, who possessed nothing, had no country—excluded as they were from the community of the nation by the ruling classes—he attributed to them the historic mission of “becoming a class of national leadership and becoming themselves the nation.” (*Italics my own.*)

For Communists *The Communist Manifesto*, joint product of Karl Marx (1818—1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820—1895), is, indeed, an “immortal” document. In the whole realm of communistic literature no other publication has exerted so potent and far-reaching an influence as the *Manifesto*. In *A Handbook of Marxism*, the official manual of orthodox Communism, the *Manifesto* occupies the first place. The last document in the *Handbook*, “A Programme of the Communist International” (1928), is, as the “Programme” itself declares, “in a sense a restatement of *The Communist Manifesto* of 1848 in relation to the imperialist stage of capitalism.”¹ The “Programme” repeats verbatim sentences of the *Manifesto*, reiterates its fundamental philosophic premises, and while it lags far behind the *Manifesto* in inflammatory eloquence, it closes on the same threatening note:

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their aims can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all the existing social conditions. Let the ruling class tremble at a Communistic revolution. The Proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries, Unite!

A few quotations will suffice to suggest the importance attached to the *Manifesto* by both Communists and non-Communists. The editor of *A Handbook of Marxism* writes:

The *Manifesto* became undoubtedly the most widespread, the most international production of all socialist literature, the common platform accepted by millions of workingmen from Siberia to California. . . . The *Manifesto* has inspired all revolutionary socialism; it is the most concise statement and the most important single document of Marxism.²

In the Foreword of his interpretation of the *Manifesto*, Ryzanoff declares:

There is no document of the working-class movement that has so clearly marked the beginning of a new phase in its development or has had so much influence on that movement as *The Communist Manifesto*. No other document has had so wide a circulation in so many languages. No serious student of the modern development of society can ignore it. It is doubtful if any book or pamphlet published at the same time still commands a

¹ *A Handbook of Marxism*, 963.

² *Op. cit.*, 21—22.

sale of some thousands per annum in a single country as is the case with the *Manifesto*.³

Theodore B. H. Brameld comments:

An example of the diversity of creeds recognizing the *Communist Manifesto* is the Menshevik party of prerevolutionary Russia, a party against which Lenin, a Bolshevik, fought vigorously.⁴

Harold J. Laski declares in his analysis of the *Manifesto*:

It is not easy to overestimate the significance of the *Manifesto*. It gave direction and a philosophy to what had been before little more than an inchoate protest against injustice. It began the long process of welding together the scattered groups of the disinherited into an organized and influential party. It freed Socialism from its earlier situation of a doctrine cherished by conspirators in defiance of government and gave to it at once a purpose and an historic background. It almost created a proletarian consciousness by giving, and for the first time, to the workers at once a high sense of their historic mission and realization of the dignity implicit in their task. . . . No description can do justice to the brilliant vigor of the whole. Every phrase of it is a challenge, and much of it has the same moving passion that distinguishes the exordium of the *Social Contract* or, in a very different type of polemic, the *Paroles d'un Croyant* of Lamennais. It is the book of men who have viewed the whole process of history from an eminence and discovered therein an inescapable lesson. It is at once an epilogue and a prophecy: an epilogue to the deception from which the workers suffered in the Revolution of 1789 and a prophecy of the land of promise they may still hope to enter.⁵

A final quotation from Otto Ruehle:

The *Manifesto* was at one and the same time a historical demonstration, a critical analysis, a program, and a prophecy. It was a masterpiece . . . Marx's amazing talent for lifting himself above the narrow confines of his actual surroundings and, as if from the zenith, looking down upon the course of evolution into a distant future, so that the law of the movement and its trend, the ensemble and the details, were equally plain to him—this marvelous faculty is here brilliantly displayed. Marx foresees all the struggles and defeats, all the stages and vacillations, all the dangers and victories, of this evolution. He watches the mechanism of the advance, numbers the steps of social ascent, feels the pulse of the bourgeoisie, hears the tread of the advancing proletariat, sees the victorious banner of the social revolution. Everything decades before the materialization of the facts, generations before their onset; everything, though seen almost as if in a vision, described with minute particularity and accurate conformability to the real.⁶

³ *The Communist Manifesto*. With an Introduction and Explanatory Notes, 3.

⁴ *A Philosophic Approach to Communism*, footnote, 3.

⁵ Karl Marx. *An Essay*. With *Communist Manifesto*, 17—18.

⁶ Karl Marx, *His Life and Work*, 130—31.

The *Manifesto* provoked an endless amount of discussion in the form of commentaries and critical analyses. Every significant idea has been exhaustively treated. Even the hardly audible overtones of the argument have been carefully recorded. In this brief paper I am presenting only what I believe to be of first importance for an appraisal of the *Manifesto*. In order that the reader may be able to judge Marx and Engels out of their own mouths, I have included many quotations from their writings. I am submitting my remarks under the following heads:

- I. The Life of Karl Marx
- II. The Wider and Immediate Background of the *Manifesto*
- III. The Argument in the *Manifesto*
- IV. The Metaphysics of the *Manifesto*

Conclusion

I. THE LIFE OF KARL MARX

Heinrich Karl Marx, a Jew, was born in 1818 at Treves (Trier), Germany. His father was converted to Christianity and baptized, but remained a thoroughgoing liberal and rationalist of the school of Diderot, Rousseau, and Voltaire.

Karl was a lad of great ability and promise. He was graduated from the *Gymnasium* in Treves in 1835. Already at that time he wrote:

We should take account in choosing our career of our intellectual and physical aptitudes, that we may not prove unequal to our task, and consider before all the possibility, greater or less, which a career offers us of working for the happiness of humanity. They should turn us from the professions which make a man a mere passive instrument or which remove him from practical activity, for, in doing useful work, one must not separate the ideal from the real, thought from practical activity.⁷

In 1836 Marx studied law at the University of Berlin. Here he became acquainted with the "Young Hegelians," a group of brilliant rebels, among whom were Ludwig Feuerbach, devastating critic of Hegel; Bruno Bauer, one of the first negative higher critics of the New Testament; David Friedrich Strauss, author of the infamous *Life of Jesus*; Arnold Ruge, philosopher and political writer; Moses Hess, one of the first Communists; Max Stirner, anarchist; and other image breakers.

⁷ Quoted by Le Rossignol in *From Marx to Stalin*, 71—72.

At Berlin Marx was much interested in the philosophy of Hegel (1770—1831), especially in Hegel's dialectics. But like other "Young Hegelians," he reacted sharply to the conservatism in Hegel's system and to Hegel's theory of the Absolute, the universal reason, or God as the primary factor of social evolution. He came to regard not the ideal, but the material aspect of nature and history to be primary. In this he was confirmed by Feuerbach's *Essence of Christianity* (1841), in which Feuerbach rejected all the idealism of Hegel and declared for thoroughgoing materialism. Some years later, however, Marx discarded Feuerbach's brand of materialism, which made of man and human thought mere *passive* products of the material world. Marx made them *active* forces.

Marx wrote his dissertation for the doctor's degree on "The Differences Between the Natural Philosophy of Democritus and Epicurus." He received the degree from the University of Jena in 1841 *in absentia*. In 1842 he became contributor to the *Rheinische Zeitung*, of which he soon became editor in chief. Because of the radical articles which it contained this newspaper was suppressed and ceased publication in 1843.

We next find Marx in Paris, studying socialism and participating in plans for the coming revolution. In June, 1843, he married Johanna, the beautiful and gifted daughter of Baron von Westphalen. The marriage was, in the main, a happy marriage, in spite of exile, chronic debt, ill health, and, at times, dire poverty. Marx's next journalistic venture was his contributions to *Deutsch-Franzoesische Jahrbuecher*, intended to be an international organ of Liberalism. Only one number of this journal appeared, but that number contains significant articles by Marx on Hegel's philosophy of law and the Jewish question. It also contains Marx's opinion of religion in the often quoted words:

Man makes religion; religion does not make man. Religion, indeed, is the self-consciousness and the self-feeling of the man who either has not yet found himself, or else (having found himself) has lost himself once more. But man is not an abstract being, squatting down somewhere outside the world. Man is the world of men, the State, the Society. *The State, this society, produce religion, produce a perverted world consciousness, because they are a perverted world.* Religion is the generalized theory of this world, its encyclopaedic compend, its logic in the popular form. . . . The fight against religion is, therefore, a direct campaign against the world whose spiritual aroma is religion. Re-

ligion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the feelings of a heartless world, just as it is the spirit of unspiritual conditions. It is the opium of the people.

The people cannot be really happy until it has been deprived of illusory happiness by the abolition of religion. The demand that the people should shake itself free of illusion as to its own condition, is the demand that it should abandon a condition which needs religion.

Thus it is the mission of history, after the otherworldly truth has disappeared, to establish the truth of this world. In the next place, it is the mission of philosophy, having entered into the service of history after the true nature of the reputed sainthood of human self-estrangement has been disclosed, to disclose all the unsaintliness of this self-estrangement. Thus the criticism of heaven is transformed into a criticism of earth, the criticism of religion into a criticism of law, the criticism of theology into a criticism of politics. (*Italics my own.*)

In Paris, Marx met the leaders of French utopian socialism as well as the anarchists Proudhon and Bakunin. Here began also his lifelong friendship with Friedrich Engels, who was his good angel to the end of his life and his literary executor and interpreter in later years. In 1844 Marx and Engels collaborated in preparing *The Holy Family*, a venomous attack on Marx's former friend Bruno Bauer. This book also contains the first clear outline of their materialistic conception of history. While this book was in process, Marx found time to write articles for *Vorwaerts*, another German radical paper. The publication of this paper resulted in the expulsion of Marx, Bakunin, and other revolutionists from Paris.

Marx moved on to Brussels. Here he collaborated with a group of other political exiles who made that city a center of communistic propaganda in eager anticipation of a social revolution. In fact, revolution was in the air in almost every country of western Europe. Writing to Marx from Barmen in 1844, Engels said: "You may turn whithersoever you please, you will stumble over Communists."

Of all protests, Chartism, a working-class movement in England, made the greatest impression on Engels and Marx and led them to think that Communism would come first in England. In the summer of 1845 Marx and Engels went to England and got in touch with the leading Chartists. After his return to Brussels, Marx wrote his *Misere de la Philosophie*, a demolishing criticism of Proudhon's *Philosophie de la Misere* (1846). That same year (1847) he also published a booklet entitled *Wage, Labor, and Capital*. Both publications

gave evidence of Marx's extensive study of political economy. Marx gave most of his time, however, to Communist propaganda. From Brussels there issued to every country of the world strong and persistent currents to incitement, call to arms, clarification, and influence. Here were centered countless threads of communication with all revolutionary foci; with representatives of the Communist ideology; with kindred movements in France, England, Germany, Poland and Switzerland.

To the last period of Marx's stay in Brussels belongs his relationship with the central committee of the Federation of the Just, with headquarters in London. In January, 1847, a member of this central committee came to Brussels empowered to ask Marx and Engels to join the federation. This group was organizing a congress at which those who held other views were either to be won over or to be cleared out. At this congress, too, the process of clarification was to be completed, and the distillate was to be formulated for propaganda purposes as a manifesto. Marx had no objection, for he had thought well of the Federation of the Just already in his Paris days and had seen no reason since to change his opinion.

The congress took place in London in the summer of 1847. Marx was unable to attend, but Engels was present. At the congress new rules and regulations were drafted, and a new name was given to the organization, but no final decisions were reached, for no decision could be valid until it had been submitted to the various local groups (communes) represented at the congress.

A second congress was summoned for December of the same year (1847). Late in November, Marx met Engels at Ostend, and the two went together to London, primarily as commissioned by the Democratic League of Brussels to participate in the meeting which the Fraternal Democrats were to hold on November 29 to commemorate the Polish revolution. Immediately after the meeting the second congress of the Federation of the Just, now known as the Communist League, was opened. This congress lasted about ten days. It definitely repudiated the old doctrines of utopian socialism. It disavowed conspiratorial tactics, inaugurated a new method of organization, and announced a new program. Among the

items of this program were: the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the dominion of the proletariat, the abolition of a class society, and the introduction of an economic and social order without private property and without classes — all in accordance with Marx's views. At the close of the congress, Marx and Engels were commissioned to draft a manifesto embodying Communist principles of the newly constructed revolutionary platform.

Marx and Engels returned to Brussels. Engels set to work promptly and wrote a draft in the form of a catechism, comprising twenty-five points, phrased in popular language, as basic constituents of the program. Marx waited a while and then decided upon a different method of presentation. Though he was guided to some extent by existing manifestoes (the *Manifesto* has close affinities with Victor Considerant's *Principe de Socialisme* not only in ideas but also in linguistic expression) which formed part of the stock in trade of every political group and club of those days, his *Manifesto* without a doubt has the imprint of his outstanding genius, original in content and in its general train of thought. It was drawn up in German a few weeks before the French Revolution of February 24, 1848. The first English translation appeared in London, 1850, with a note saying that it was the most revolutionary document ever given to the world.

When the news of the February Revolution reached Brussels, the police took speedy action, arrested Marx and his wife, kept them in jail for one night, and deported them the next day. They went to Paris to join their comrades and there, if possible, to give the movement a Communistic turn. Finding no suitable field of activity in Paris, Marx and Engels went to Germany, began the publication in Cologne of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, red flag of revolution. But already the Communist cause was hopeless, and the democratic movement itself was losing ground. In February, 1849, Marx and Engels were prosecuted for advocating armed resistance to the authorities, but, overawed by Marx's brilliant defense of himself and his cause, the jury acquitted them. But the paper was suppressed, and Marx, editor in chief, was ordered to leave the country within twenty-four hours.

Marx returned to Paris. He was expelled also from here. He now settled with his family in London, where, apart from a

few visits to the Continent, he spent the rest of his life very largely in poverty, misery, and illness. While giving considerable time to the organization and promotion of the First International, he spent most of his efforts in indefatigable research in the British Museum and in writing articles and books, especially *Capital*, the Bible of Communism. He died in March, 1883. In his funeral address for his friend and companion in arms, Engels said:

Marx was above all a revolutionary, and his great aim in life was to co-operate in this or that fashion in the overthrow of capitalist society and the State institutions which it has created, to co-operate in the emancipation of the modern proletariat, to whom he was the first to give a consciousness of its class position and its class needs, a knowledge of the conditions necessary for its emancipation. In this struggle he was in his element, and he fought with a passion, tenacity, and success granted to few.

II. THE WIDER AND IMMEDIATE BACKGROUND OF THE MANIFESTO

In order to appreciate the fundamental ideas in the *Manifesto*, one must take into consideration the background which is directly or indirectly reflected in the *Manifesto*. There had been the political and industrial revolutions. On the political horizon one notes in particular such significant individuals as Voltaire, Rousseau, the French Encyclopaedists, Thomas Paine, Danton, Marat, and Robespierre. One must bear in mind also factors leading up to, and the results of, the American Revolution and the French Revolution, the Reign of Terror, and the restoration of the Bourbons. The slogan of the French Revolution "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" still resounded in the hearts and minds of those who saw themselves disappointed and disillusioned after the fall of Napoleon. Particularly in Germany, Austria, and France liberals were smarting under the despotic rule of Metternich. In the twenties and thirties censorship had become unbearably oppressive. There was in the political atmosphere an uncontrollable restlessness and decided opposition to every form of absolute control. Marx was perhaps not far from the truth when he said in the first paragraph of the *Manifesto*: "All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this specter [Communism]: Pope and Tsar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies."

It was the time of great industrial changes: Kay's flying

shuttle, Watt's steam engine, Hargreave's spinning jenny, Crompton's power loom, Stephenson's locomotive engine, and many other inventions. These, together with co-operating forces, ruined old and established handicrafts, created the factory system, built great manufacturing and mercantile cities, brought together large numbers of wage earners. This situation ushered in the modern labor movement and aroused the working classes to a consciousness of their interests, their power, and their destiny.

Furthermore, long before the days of Marx, the right of private property had been questioned. Abbé Morelly had in his *Code de la Nature* (1755) condemned private property, demanded the common ownership of all wealth, and agitated that all industries should be publicly controlled. Noël Babeuf (1760—1797), a French revolutionist agitator and journalist, had ardently proclaimed the views of Morelly and popularized the slogan: "Happiness Consists in Equality." Babeuf organized the "Society of Equals," engaged in a communistic conspiracy against the Directorate, and was guillotined in 1797. Socialists refer to the conspiracy of Babeuf as the classic example of premature and futile attempts to establish Communism before the time was ripe.

Among Englishmen who in their writings had expressed extreme communistic tendencies were William Godwin (1756 to 1836) and William Thompson (1783—1833). Godwin published in 1793 *Enquiry Concerning Human Justice*. He writes: "What is misnamed wealth is merely a power vested in certain individuals by the institution of society to compel others to labor for their benefit." This is, in a nutshell, the doctrine of surplus value, elaborated by Marx in *Capital*. Thompson published in 1824 "*An Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth Most Conducive to Human Happiness*." He assumes that all value in exchange is derived from labor alone; anticipating Marx, he infers that the whole product of labor should belong to the sole producers. However, inasmuch as the laborers receive not what they produce, but mere subsistence, the landowners and capitalists receive the rest in the form of rent and interest. Here again is the theory of surplus value tersely expressed twenty-four years before the appearance of the *Manifesto*.

Marx and Engels were very much interested in Chartism.

This is the first labor movement in England. It derives its name from the "People's Charter," a petition signed by great numbers of people in England, chiefly the working class, and presented to the House of Commons on May 2, 1842, and again on April 10, 1848. The famous "Six Points" of the Charter — universal manhood suffrage, annual parliaments, vote by ballot, no property qualifications for members, payment of members, and equal voting districts — were all political demands. But back of these demands was widespread discontent, with economic conditions and the determination of the Chartist leaders to use the political power, when gained, for the uplift of the masses, if not for the realization of socialism.

In Europe there were current various forms of socialism ranging all the way from vague utopian socialism to ultrared anarchistic Communism or communistic anarchism. Mention should be made especially of the type of socialism promoted by Robert Owen (1771—1855) and Francois Charles Fourier (1772—1837). Both proposed gradual socialization by the creation of small experimental communities which, if successful, would multiply, federate, and ultimately bring about national and even international socialism — the "federation of the world." Owen was interested in several of these ventures, the most notable of which was the New Harmony Community of Equality, in Indiana, an experiment that failed after three years of struggle (1824—1827). Several other Owenite settlements were started in the United States, but all shared the fate of New Harmony. Fourier had similar plans for small communities, or "phalanges," which he hoped would be established through the generosity of wealthy men. During twelve years he remained at home at noon every day waiting for a millionaire to come along and lay down the necessary capital. Fourierism made slight progress in France, but there was a veritable wave of it in the United States under the leadership of such men as Albert Brisbane and Horace Greeley. Some thirty-three settlements were founded, of which the longest-lived was the Wisconsin Phalanx (1844 to 1850), and the most famous was the Brook Farm (1841—1846). More successful than any of the Fourieristic communities, and directly connected with them, was Etienne Cabet's (1788 to 1856) Icaria, first established in Texas in 1848, which survived, with numerous changes and removals, until the year

1898. Marx and Engels took note of these various forms of socialism in the third part of the *Manifesto* but found fault with all of them because from their point of view they represented a compromising attitude. They disposed of them as follows:

Utopians reject all political and especially all revolutionary action; they wish to attain their ends by peaceful means and endeavor, by small experiments, necessarily doomed to failure, and by force of example, to pave the way for the new social gospel. . . . They still dream of experimental realization of their social Utopias, of founding isolated "phalansteres," of establishing "Home Colonies," of setting up a "Little Icaria" — duodecimo editions of the New Jerusalem, and to realize all these castles in the air, they are compelled to appeal to the feelings and purses of the bourgeois.⁸

In addition to the above considerations there were other factors which played into the thinking of Marx and Engels in the fifth decade of the nineteenth century. Such were the prison reforms in England, the emancipation of slaves, the beginnings of factory legislation, the Reform Bill of 1832, the prestige enjoyed by the great English economists Malthus and Ricardo. In Germany, poets like Freiligrath, Herwegh, Prutz, and others who were more or less in sympathy with the "Young Germany" movement used their talents to foment revolution. In Paris the archenemy of Prussianism, the Jew Heinrich Heine, a friend of Karl Marx, was dipping his pen into red ink and dashing off poems like this:

Ein neues Lied, ein bess'res Lied,
Ihr Freunde, will ich euch dichten,
Wir wollen hier auf Erden schon
Das Himmelreich errichten.

Wir wollen auf Erden gluecklich sein
Und wollen nicht mehr darben,
Verschlemmen soll nicht der faule Bauch,
Was fleiss'ge Haende erwarben.

Es waechst auf Erden Brot genug
Fuer alle Menschenkinder,
Und Rosen und Myrten, Glueck und Lust
Und Zuckererbsen nicht minder.

Ja, Zuckererbsen fuer jedermann,
Sobald die Schoten platzen;
Den Himmel ueberlassen wir
Den Engeln und den Spatzen.

⁸ *A Handbook of Marxism*, 54—56.

In England thousands listened eagerly to the orations of Feargus O'Connor, Bronterre O'Brien, and other agitators, and vociferously applauded such utterance as these:

Wages should form the price of goods;
Yes, wages should be all.
Then those who work to make the goods
Should justly have them all.

But if their price be made of rent,
Tithes, taxes, profits, all,
Then we who work to make the goods
Shall have — just none at all.

III. THE ARGUMENT IN THE MANIFESTO

The *Manifesto* covers only thirty-seven pages in the *Hand-book* (22—59). It begins with a brief introduction, in which the authors state the occasion for the publication of the *Manifesto* as well as its purpose. The chief paragraph reads:

It is high time that Communists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet this nursery tale of the specter of Communism with a manifesto of the party itself.

The body of the *Manifesto* is divided into four parts. They are:

- I. Bourgeois and Proletarians
- II. Proletarians and Communists
- III. Socialist and Communist Literature
- IV. Position of the Communists in Relation to the Various Existing Opposition Parties

In Part One, "Bourgeois and Proletarians," the authors aim to show historically that the time has come when the bourgeoisie must be overthrown and be replaced by a new society, the communistic commonwealth. The premise on which the argument rests is stated in the first sentence: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." Proceeding from this premise, the authors aim to show that modern society represented by the two classes bourgeoisie and proletariat is the historical product of feudal society with its lords and serfs. Responsible for this evolution are the instruments of production and the relations of production developed in feudal society. These economic forces in course of time broke the fetters of the feudal system, destroyed it, and inaugurated the present form of society.

But also this form of society is doomed. It is even now fast disintegrating, due to the same factors which brought about the dissolution of feudalism, viz., the instruments and relations of production. The bourgeoisie (capitalism) is becoming more and more powerful, more and more oppressive, and the lot of the proletariat is becoming more and more miserable and intolerable. Economic forces are going out of bounds, can no longer be controlled by the bourgeoisie, and are compelling society to surrender, not, however, to a new dichotomy of classes, but to a classless society, the communistic commonwealth. When the dictatorship of the proletariat has crushed the bourgeoisie, has firmly established itself, there will not be another class struggle, but there will be liberty and equality for all. This new status is not achieved by compromise with the bourgeoisie. It is achieved only by force, by a revolution. It is bound to come. "What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own gravediggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable."⁹

In Part Two, "Proletarians and Communists," the authors seek to establish the relation of the existing Communist party to the proletarians not connected with the party. They say that the party has no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole. They are merely the leaders in the class, "the most advanced and resolute section of the working class parties in every country." The authors then define and try to justify the specific aims of the Communist party. Toward the close they list the ten demands of the Communist party:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the State by means of a national bank with the State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, 36.

8. Equal obligation of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by a more equable distribution of the population over the country.
10. Free education of all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc.

In Part Three the authors examine and criticize various forms of socialism. They are: feudal socialism; petty bourgeois socialism; German, or "true," socialism; conservative, or bourgeois, socialism; critical-utopian socialism and Communism. Regarding Christian Socialism, they say:

As the parson has ever gone hand in hand with the landlord, so has Clerical Socialism with Feudal Socialism. Nothing is easier than to give Christian asceticism a Socialist tinge. Has not Christianity declaimed against private property, against marriage, against the State? Has it not preached, in the place of these, charity and poverty, celibacy and mortification of the flesh, monastic life and Mother Church? Christian Socialism is but the holy water with which the priest consecrates the heart-burnings of the aristocrat.¹⁰

In Part Four the authors urge Communists in France, Switzerland, Poland, and Germany with whom and with whom not they are to align themselves in carrying out the revolution. Marx and Engels believed that the revolution would begin in Germany. The paragraph reads:

The Communists turn their attention chiefly to Germany, because that country is on the eve of a bourgeois revolution which is bound to be carried out under more advanced conditions of European civilization and with a much more developed proletariat than that of England was in the seventeenth, and of France in the eighteenth century, and because the bourgeois revolution in Germany will be but the prelude to an immediately following proletarian revolution.¹¹

Other significant paragraphs in the final section are:

Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.¹²

In all these movements, Communists bring to the front, as the leading question in each, the property question, no matter what its degree of development at the time.¹³

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, 49.

¹² *Ibid.*, 59.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, 59.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 59.

IV. THE METAPHYSICS OF THE MANIFESTO

The *Manifesto* was intended to incite a revolution. It is a call to arms. But it is more than that. It is also a declaration of the grounds which, in the opinion of Marx and Engels, justify the proletariat revolution. It is a rationale designed to kindle in the minds of proletarians the heroic faith that they were about to engage in a great crusade, in a holy war, which would result in an emancipation never before achieved in history and which would lead them into the promised land of complete social equality and security.

It is customary to speak of four basic suppositions which underlie the *Manifesto*. They are commonly referred to as the Marxian dialectics, the class struggle, economic determinism (or historical materialism), and the labor theory of value and surplus value. With the exception of the last, which Marx worked out in great detail after 1848 and to which he gave classic expression in *Capital* (1867), the first three suppositions are so closely interrelated already in the early writings of Marx and Engels that it is difficult to tell which originated first in their minds. So much seems certain that Marx was never interested in any one of these three suppositions *per se*; that is to say, Marx never discusses them with the cold objectivity and impartiality of a true scientist or mathematician. Rather he uses them exclusively in support of his program of revolution. This is not to say, however, that Marx and Engels may not have been thoroughly persuaded in their own minds of the truth of their suppositions. If there is anything in the writings of Marx and Engels which impresses the reader, it is the assurance and persistence with which both Marx and Engels present their ideas. Perhaps it was this profound belief not only in the righteousness of their cause but also in the rightness of their philosophy which more than all other factors accounted for the almost immediate success of the *Manifesto* and which to this day continues to gain converts. As will be noted in the following pages, these suppositions are subject to grave considerations. On the other hand, the implicit faith placed in them by orthodox Communists seems another indication that humanity at large is swayed not by sound and cogent reasonings and by scientifically established evidence, but rather by faith in a great cause.

A. MARXIAN DIALECTICS

Marx had come under the influence of the Hegelian system as a student at Berlin. Though he, in course of time, rebelled against Hegel's idealism and conservatism, he never gave up his faith in the dialectic process. There is no need to develop in detail the oftentimes abstruse and inane deliveries of Hegel. It is enough to recall that Hegel had applied the triad of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis to logic, nature, and history. What fascinated Marx in this interpretation was the moving power manifest in history and the conflict of opposing forces. Just as Hegel believed that the thesis brings about not only opposition, but also contradiction and conflict, resulting in a higher synthesis, so Marx believed that there is evident in the world of phenomena, especially in history, change and conflict. *The Communist Manifesto*, since it was written for proletarians, makes no attempt anywhere to define in philosophical terms Hegel's strange metaphysics. But one acquainted with Hegel's system soon detects in the *Manifesto* a bright reflection of the Hegelian dialectic process. It operates in the *Manifesto* thus: the bourgeoisie is the synthesis of medieval burghers and serfs. It is at the same time a new thesis negating itself and calling into being the proletariat. The conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie culminates for Marx in a new synthesis, the communistic commonwealth. The dialectic process is evident also in the economic forces which from Marx's point of view bring about the class struggle. One stage in the economic process constitutes for Marx the thesis. This thesis negates itself, resulting in an antithetic economic development. The conflict between the two results in an economic synthesis which in its turn becomes a new thesis.

It should be noted however that whereas Hegel believed the dialectic process to go on endlessly, Marx was persuaded that it would come to an end in the establishment of the communistic commonwealth. There are other differences between Marx and Hegel. For Hegel, the dialectic process was one through which reason, by the merger of opposites, advances in self-development to the perfection of the absolute Spirit; for Marx the dialectic process meant the interpretation of the conflict of opposing classes. For Hegel, dialectic was primarily a philosophic concept; for Marx it was a social

dynamic. For Hegel, the dialectic process meant the sublime contemplation of an otherworldly spiritual Idea; Marx was passionately concerned with the material conditions which would emancipate the toiling helots of history. Hegel attempted to write a philosophy of history; Marx attempted to change it. Hegel says: "When we see a new phenomenon in history, we need do nothing about it." Marx says: "When we see a new phenomenon in history, as Communism, we must do something about it — we must promote it." Hegel says: "Preserve the State!" Marx says, "Smash the State."

B. THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Part One of the *Manifesto* begins:

The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large or in the common ruin of the contending class. . . . The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones. . . . Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other — bourgeoisie and proletariat.¹⁴

Here we have a clear formulation by Marx and Engels of the doctrine of the class struggle. Marx and Engels never relinquished this doctrine. In 1879 they wrote:

For almost forty years we have stressed the class struggle as the immediate driving force of history and in particular the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat as the great lever of the modern social revolution.¹⁵

In the 1888 preface to the *Manifesto* Engels wrote:

The whole history of mankind, since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership, has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes.

Unfortunately, Marx and Engels never defined in detail what they meant by "class." At the end of the third volume of *Capital*, Marx's last work, he asks the question: "What con-

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, 22—23.

¹⁵ Quoted by Le Rossignol from *Marx-Engels Selected Correspondence*, 376.

stitutes a class?" but the question remains unanswered, except that three great social classes are mentioned — wage laborers, capitalists, and landlords — each of which has its characteristic income, giving its members a common economic interest, and at the same time an opposition to the interests of the other two, which leads to antagonism and conflict. Marx goes on to explain that there are other social groups, such as physicians and officials, and subgroups as well, as when "landlords are divided into the owners of vineyards, farms, forests, mines, fisheries." These may have been the last written words of Karl Marx, to which the editor, Friedrich Engels, his friend for so many years, added the laconic finale: "Here the manuscript ends."

The question arises: "Why did primitive Communism pass away?" To this question Engels replies in substance: This was due to the domestication of animals, the use of iron and tools and weapons, improvements in agriculture, the division of labor, the exchange of commodities, and the getting of captives in war. These were among the productive forces which became incompatible with the communistic organization, broke it up, and created a new social system based on private property in persons and things.¹⁶

Following primitive Communism, so Marx and Engels tell us, came civilization — ancient, medieval, modern, with three forms of servitude: slavery, serfdom, and wage labor. Just as slavery and serfdom rose up in judgment against their oppressors, so also modern wage labor is rising up against its oppressor, the bourgeoisie or capitalism. Marx and Engels admit:

The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. . . . It has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former exoduses of nations and crusades.¹⁷

Yet whatever good it may have done, the bourgeoisie has become guilty of crimes that cry to high heaven:

The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has piti-

¹⁶ Engels, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," *Handbook*, 301 ff.

¹⁷ *A Handbook of Marxism*, 26, 28.

lessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors" and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous "cash payment." It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervor, of chivalrous enthusiasms, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms has set up the single, unconscionable freedom—Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation veiled by religious and political illusions it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.¹⁸

As a result of this exploitation by the bourgeoisie, proletarians are sinking deeper and deeper into misery. But their day of salvation is coming. Most of the petty bourgeoisie are being driven to the wall and are joining the proletariat. Thus the proletariat is rapidly growing in number. It is also organizing and forming unions. Besides, capitalism will inevitably collapse under its own weight. Financial crises are increasing because too much capital and surplus value is invested in overproduction and too little is being paid as wages to furnish purchasing power. Surplus stocks will close plants, increase unemployment, create depressions. The worse the situation becomes for the proletariat, the more conscious will the latter become of their true destiny and the closer will they become knit together in a common brotherhood. Indeed, as Marx and Engels wrote in later years, the State as the agency of the interests of capitalism will cultivate the propaganda that the State is above all classes and that all are one, with identical or harmonious interests. Strikes will be broken by the force of the government which always stands in defense of the *status quo*. But at the opportune time the proletariat will dare the revolution, overthrow the bourgeoisie, establish itself firmly in power, and establish the communistic commonwealth.

A brief examination of the premise that "all history is the history of class struggles and that society was originally communistic" yields these results:

1. The assumption that society began its course as a communistic society is an unproved theory.

2. The assumption that class opposition is necessarily identical with class struggle and conflict is a theory. Opposites oftentimes attract each other. M. J. Adler puts it

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, 25.

this way: "Even Marx failed to make this fine distinction: he confuses opposition, which suggests compromise, with contradiction or complete negation. Certainly, the unity of opposites involves co-operation."¹⁹

3. Marx's statement that "society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other — bourgeoisie and proletariat,"²⁰ is hardly factual. It is a case of the wish being father to the thought. Even now, almost a hundred years after the publication of the *Manifesto*, society is not split into two antagonistic groups. Society, at least in our country, is a network of numerous groups, occupational, political, social, religious, educational — whose connections and interests are so interwoven that they cannot and will not divide according to the formula of the class struggle and the wishful thinking of Marx. To speak of the rich and the poor, the haves and the have-nots, the privileged and the underprivileged, is legitimate only within limitations. One glance at the Federal income-tax table impresses one with the sober truth that American society is divided into a wide range of categories. The middle class (Marx's petty bourgeoisie) is not disappearing, but rather increasing in number, income, wealth, and power, and, if our interpretation of recent events is correct, by no means intends to abdicate in favor of a revolutionary proletariat. In his analysis of American society, Kirby Page reaches the conclusion:

The evidence is inescapable that this nation is overwhelmingly middle class, or bourgeois, in composition. Genuine proletarians do not constitute more than one third of the population, while the entire body of completely disinherited — those who "have only their chains to lose" — probably does not exceed twenty per cent.²¹

4. One cannot prove that all societies must exhibit a uniform, even if uneven, social development from primitive Communism to slavery, from slavery to feudalism, from feudalism to capitalism, and from capitalism to socialism.²²

In view of the above grave considerations, one understands why Sidney Hook is compelled to admit:

¹⁹ *Dialectic*, quoted by Le Rossignol, 118.

²⁰ *A Handbook of Marxism*, 23.

²¹ Quoted by Le Rossignol, 223.

²² John Dewey, in *Why I am Not a Communist*, in Sidney Hook's *The Meaning of Marx*.

If the facts of the class struggle can be successfully called in question, the whole theoretical construction of Marx crashes to the ground.²³

C. ECONOMIC DETERMINISM

If one asks: "What is the propelling force in history? What is the factor which exclusively or at least predominantly determines and shapes the progress of society?" one must expect a great variety of answers. Marx and Engels were much interested in this question, and both arrived, each in his own way, at the same answer. That answer was: Not the ideas of great leaders, not social institutions, not prevailing ideologies, not geographic environment, not biological factors, but economic conditions, especially the method of production of the time. If, for instance, in different periods we have slave labor, then the feudal windmill, and later the industrial steam mill or factory, these will not only affect the lives of the owners and workers, but also the institutions of the period, and even the ideas.

In the following, C. S. Lewis gives a graphic account of a Communist steeped in economic determinism:

I was not left very long at the mercy of the Tousle-Headed Poet, because another passenger interrupted our conversation: but before that happened, I had learned a good deal about him. He appeared to be a singularly ill-used man. His parents had never appreciated him, and none of the five schools at which he had been educated seemed to have made any provision for a talent and temperament such as his. To make matters worse, he had been exactly the sort of boy in whose case the examination system works out with the maximum unfairness and absurdity. It was not until he reached the university that he began to recognize that all these injustices did not come by chance, but were the inevitable results of our economic system. Capitalism did not merely enslave the workers, it also vitiated taste and vulgarized intellect: hence our educational system and hence the lack of "Recognition" for new genius. This discovery had made him a Communist. But when the war came along and he saw Russia in alliance with the capitalist governments, he had found himself once more isolated and had to become a conscientious objector. The indignities he suffered at this stage of his career had, he confessed, embittered him. He decided that he could serve the cause best by going to America: but then America came into the war too. It was at this point that he suddenly saw Sweden as the home of a really new and radical art, but the various oppressors had given him no facilities for going to Sweden. There were money troubles. His father, who had never progressed beyond the most atrocious mental complacency and smugness of the Victorian epoch, was giving him a ludicrously inadequate allowance. And he had

²³ Quoted by Le Rossignol, 228.

been very badly treated by a girl too. He had thought her a really civilized and adult personality, and then she had unexpectedly revealed that she was a mass of bourgeois prejudices and monogamic instincts. Jealousy, possessiveness, was a quality he particularly disliked. She had even shown herself, at the end, to be mean about money. That was the last straw. He had jumped under a train. . . .²⁴

The above explanation of economic determinism (often called historical materialism) may be an oversimplification. But it comes reasonably near to what Marx and Engels had in mind whenever they wrote about the propelling factor in history. Reasonably near. Because Marx and Engels do not define clearly what they mean by such oft-recurring phrases as "modes of production, conditions of production, relations of production, property relations, productive forces," and the like. There is furthermore the consideration that in one of his letters to Marx, Engels made the admission:

According to the materialist conception of history, the determining element in history is *ultimately* the production and reproduction in real life. More than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted. If therefore somebody twists this into the statement that the economic element is the *only* determining one, he transforms it into a meaningless, abstract, and absurd phrase. The economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure . . . also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their form. . . . We make our own history, but in the first place under very definite presuppositions and conditions. Among these the economic ones are finally decisive. But the political, etc., ones, and indeed even the traditions which haunt human minds, also play a part, though not the decisive one.²⁵

In view of the above explanation by Engels, it may not be fair to make out of Marx and Engels thoroughgoing economic determinists. On the other hand, they themselves are to blame if interpreters, even orthodox Communists, have classified them as such. In his oration at the funeral of Marx, March 17, 1883, Engels said:

Just as Darwin discovered the law of evolution in organic nature, so Marx discovered the law of evolution in human history. He discovered the simple fact that human beings must have food and drink, clothing and shelter, *first of all*, before they can interest themselves in political science, art, religion, and the like. This implies that the production of the immediately requisite material means of subsistence, and therewith the extant economic developmental phase of a nation or an epoch, constitute the foundation

²⁴ C. S. Lewis, *The Great Divorce*, 6—7.

²⁵ Quoted by Le Rossignol, 139, from *Marx-Engels, Selected Correspondence*.

upon which the state institutions, the legal outlook, the artistic and even the religious ideas of those concerned have been built up. It implies that these latter must be explained out of the former, whereas usually the former have been explained as issuing from the latter.

In 1888, in his preface to the English translation of the *Manifesto*, Engels wrote:

The *Manifesto* being our joint production, I consider myself bound to state that the fundamental proposition which forms the nucleus belongs to Marx. That proposition is: that in every historical epoch the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange and the social organization necessarily following from it form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of the epoch. Finally, in 1893, two years before his death, Engels declared:

The materialistic concept of history starts from the proposition that the production of the means to support human life, and, next to production, the exchange of things produced, is the basis of all social structure; that in every society that has appeared in history the manner in which wealth is distributed and society is divided into classes or orders is dependent upon what is produced, how it is produced, and how the products are exchanged. From this point of view the final causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in men's brains, not in man's better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange. They are to be sought, not in the philosophy, but in the economics of each particular epoch.²⁶

The *Manifesto* is replete with passages which reflect the author's profound faith in economic determinism. Here are a few:

The modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange.²⁷

Your [the bourgeoisie] very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property, just as your jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into a law for all, a will whose essential character and direction are determined by the economical conditions of existence of your class. The selfish misconception that induces you to transform into eternal laws of nature and of reason the social forms springing from your present mode of production and form of property — historical relations that rise and disappear in the progress of production — this misconception you share with every ruling class that has preceded you.²⁸

And your education! Is not that also social and determined by the social conditions under which you educate, by the intervention, direct or indirect, of society, by means of schools, etc.? ²⁹

²⁶ Quoted by Le Rossignol, 127, from *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*.

²⁷ *A Handbook of Marxism*, 24.

²⁸ *Op. cit.*, 41.

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, 42.

The charges against Communism made from a religious, a philosophical, and, generally, from an ideological standpoint are not deserving of serious examination. Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views, and conceptions, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relations, and in his social life?³⁰

To the charge against Communism that there are eternal truths, such as freedom, justice, etc., that are common to all states of society and that Communism, by abolishing eternal truths, abolishes all religion and all morality, instead of constituting them on a new basis, Marx and Engels reply:

One fact is common to all past ages, viz., the exploitation of one part of society by the other. No wonder, then, that the social consciousness of past ages, despite all the multiplicity and variety it displays, moves within certain common forms or general ideas, which cannot completely vanish except with the total disappearance of class antagonisms.

What else does the history of ideas prove than that intellectual production changes its character in proportion as material production is changed? The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class.³¹

In attempting to evaluate the theory of economic determinism as expressed by Marx and Engels, one arrives at conclusions such as the following:

1. One can hardly deny that the largely monopolistic ownership of the means of production by the property-owning class, on the one hand, and the economic dependence of the vast army of wage workers and the unemployed, on the other, does affect and, to some extent, mold the institutions, the laws, the economic and political organization of society, the ideas of men and the history of our time.

2. No one will deny that there have been conflicts among men motivated largely, if not altogether, by economic consideration.

3. But, as Laski observes:

The insistence upon an economic background as the whole explanation [of social phenomena and development] is radically false. No economic conditions can explain the suicidal nationalism of the Balkans. The war of 1914 may have been largely due to conflicting commercial imperialisms; but there was also a competition of national ideas which was in no point economic. Historically, too, the part played by religion in the determination of social outlook was, until at least the Peace of Westphalia, as important as that played by material conditions. Luther repre-

³⁰ *Op. cit.*, 44.

³¹ *Op. cit.*, 44—45.

sents something more than a protest against the financial exactions of Rome. The impulses of men, in fact, are never referable to any single source. The love of power, herd instinct, rivalry, the desire of display, all these are hardly less vital than the acquisitiveness which explains the strength of material environment.³²

Similarly, Le Rossignol:

Marx omits consideration of the biological factor. Both the biological and the economic factors are important. The relations of sex, the growth of population, the family, the tribe, and the closely connected phenomena of race, nationality, government, morality, law, and other institutions are driving forces in human evolution as much as any modes of production and exchange. Human nature plays a part, with its native urge toward physical and mental activity; his love of liberty, adventure, play, struggle, conquest, power; his creative activity in literature, music, dancing, building, and art; his wonder, fear, hope, love, insatiable curiosity, and the expression of them in religion, philosophy, and devotion to science. Then there are relatively obscure forces of which the historian must take account, such as chance, caprice, irrational behavior, abnormal mentality, and the achievements of great men, all of which contribute toward the resultant of many forces which is the march of history.

In short, one can thus see the futility of any monistic explanation of history. War, frequently, is a sort of game rather than a struggle for land or plunder. The Crusades were largely the result of religious enthusiasm. The family is not a mere unit of economic activity and division of labor. The State, which Marx believed to be the result of economic determinism ("the executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the affairs of the whole bourgeoisie," *Manifesto*, p. 25), is, at its worst, something more than an instrument of exploitation; at its best it is the servant of the people as a whole. There are moral standards that have to do with personal rights rather than property. Law is not altogether made by the ruling classes for their own benefit. Great men may be the product of their times, but whether for good or ill, they add something unique to the course of events (Paul, Mahomet, Marx, etc.). The spirit of Protestantism, which Marx believed to be a bourgeoisie development, is far more than he saw in it. In short, ideology itself, whether true or false, beneficial or harmful, has been a great force in social evolution.³³

And certainly, the Christian religion has in a tremendous degree helped to shape and determine the course of history from the beginnings of the Christian era.

Closely related to the theory of economic determinism is Marx's labor theory of value and surplus value. The *Manifesto* contains a number of passages in which the authors express their theory. Chief among them are:

³² *An Essay. With the Communist "Manifesto,"* 36.

³³ Le Rossignol, *Op. cit.*, 122-140.

The cost of production of a workman is restricted, almost entirely, to the means of subsistence that he requires for his maintenance and for the propagation of his race. But the price of a commodity, and therefore also of labor, is equal to its cost of production.³⁴

The average price of wage labor is the minimum wage, i. e., that quantum of the means of subsistence which is absolutely requisite to keep the laborer in bare existence as a laborer.³⁵

Does wage labor create any property for the laborer? Not a bit. It creates capital, i. e., that kind of property which exploits wage labor and which cannot increase except upon condition of begetting a new supply of wage labor for fresh exploitation.³⁶

Inasmuch, however, as Marx and Engels did not develop their labor theory of value and of surplus value in the *Manifesto*, but merely posit it without further analysis, I am not discussing it in this paper.

CONCLUSION

In closing this investigation of *The Communist Manifesto*, I again call attention to its fundamental aim and purpose: to tell the world what Communism is and wants, and to incite a proletarian revolution. However doubtful or false its metaphysics are, the *Manifesto* has, as a revolutionary document, been eminently successful. After all, revolutions are not motivated and brought about by philosophical considerations. They are the passionate outburst of pent-up and deep-seated grievances. As in Locke's *Treatises*, so in the *Manifesto*, the metaphysics are largely an afterthought, designed to justify, in Locke's case, a past revolution; in Marx's case, a revolution still to come.

The question is in order: "To what extent, if any, does the Soviet Union carry out the program and metaphysics laid down by Marx and Engels in the *Manifesto*?" It is impossible to answer this question with any degree of finality, since there is too little reliable news leaking out of Russia. So much is certain. The communistic commonwealth has not yet arrived in Russia, and the dictatorship of the proletariat is actually the dictatorship of the thirteen members of the Politburo of the Communist party. Judging by the difficulties which American and British statesmen are encountering in their dealings with the Soviet Union, it seems evident that the Politburo has returned, since the Moscow conference of last

³⁴ *A Handbook of Marxism*, 30.

³⁵ *Op. cit.*, 39.

³⁶ *Op. cit.*, 38.

December, to the *status quo ante bellum* and therefore regards foreign nations with a capitalist economy as inevitable enemies of the Soviet Union. Readers interested in what may be going on behind the "iron curtain" will do well to read carefully the last document in *A Handbook of Marxism*, "The Programme of the Communist International," and the two outstanding articles recently contributed to *Life Magazine* by John Foster Dulles (June 3 and 10).

I did not include in this study a discussion of such important items referred to in the *Manifesto* as the means of subsistence, the nature of capital, the status of woman in bourgeois society, and the ten demands of the Communist party, especially the first, "Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes." For Marx and Engels the attainment of this objective was absolutely essential and prerequisite for the establishment of the communistic commonwealth. Therefore they wrote: "In all these movements [revolutionary] they [Communists] bring to the front, as the leading question in each, the property question, no matter what its degree of development at the time."³⁷

All the aforementioned items are of such significance that they require careful and extensive treatment in another chapter.

Bibliography

- Bowden, Witt, and Others. *An Economic History of Europe since 1750*. New York, American Book Company, 1937.
- Brameld, Theodore B. H. *A Philosophic Approach to Communism*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1933.
- Ensor, R. C. K. *Modern Socialism*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.
- A Handbook of Marxism*. Being a Collection of Extracts from the Writings of Marx, Engels, and the Greatest of Their Followers. New York, International Publishers, 1935.
- Hook, Sidney, and Others. *The Meaning of Marx*. A Symposium. New York, Farrar and Rinehart, 1934.
- Laski, Harold J. *Karl Marx*. An Essay. With *Communist Manifesto*. London, Geo. Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1925.
- Le Rossignol, James Edward. *From Marx to Stalin*. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1940.
- Marx, Karl. *The Communist Manifesto, and Other Writings*. New York, The Modern Library, 1932.
- Rühle, Otto. *Karl Marx. His Life and Work*. New York, The Viking Press, 1929.
- Ryazanoff, D. *The Communist Manifesto*. With an Introduction and Explanatory Notes. London, Martin Lawrence, 1930.
- Walther, C. F. W. *Communismus und Socialismus*. St. Louis, Mo., 1878.

³⁷ *Op. cit.*, 59.

Homiletics

Outlines on the Standard Epistle Lessons

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

PHIL. 1:3-11

You are a Christian. You believe in your Savior Jesus Christ. And you know that whosoever believeth in Him shall not perish, but have eternal life.

But will you persevere in faith? The devil and the world are enemies of your soul. Your sinful flesh is their strong ally. What assurance have you of remaining in faith? And what certainty have you of salvation?

The Apostle answers this question in our text in which he speaks of

THE CERTAINTY OF SALVATION

showing

I. Its foundation

II. Its effects

I

A. The Apostle thanks God for having brought the Philippians into the fellowship in the Gospel and for having preserved them in this fellowship until now (vv. 3-5). Fellowship in the Gospel is nothing else than faith — believing appropriation of the blessings of the Gospel. (Show from Acts 16:14-40 how the congregation at Philippi was founded.) Such faith is given by God (Phil. 1:29), and is a gift of grace (v. 7). Explanation of Third Article. It is God who worketh all spiritual life (v. 6; Phil. 2:13).

B. What God has begun, He purposes to finish (v. 6). God does not convert a person on trial. His sincere purpose from the very beginning of the new life in a person is that the end, everlasting life, shall be reached (2 Pet. 3:9). We are not left to shift for ourselves, but are the object of God's care (Ps. 103:13; Eph. 3:14-21). God is almighty, so that no one can pluck us out of His hand (John 10:29). And this is the promise God gives to the believers (John 10:28-29; Is. 54:10; 49:14-16; 1 Cor. 1:8; 1 Thess. 5:23-24; 1 Pet. 1:5; Rom. 8:38-39).

C. Thus the certainty of our salvation is not founded upon anything within us — our emotions, pious living, etc. — but solely upon the gracious will, mercy, promises, and power of God. And this certainty is a certainty of faith (v. 6).

II

A. Some people think it is a mistake to assure the believer of the certainty of his salvation. They say such teaching leads to carnal security, undermines the doctrine of sanctification, and destroys Christian life and zeal. (Cf. *Trigl.* 1,065.) Such people do not understand what it means to be in the fellowship in the Gospel, nor do they grasp the significance of the certainty of salvation.

B. Certainty of salvation is a certainty of faith which God works in us through the Word. Faith is not an inactive conviction, but a powerful force which controls and permeates our thoughts and life. Faith produces good works. And the more the believer realizes that he owes everything concerning his salvation to God, the more eager he is to show his appreciation by serving the Lord. Hence, v. 9-11. Certainty of salvation will induce a believer to abound more and more in love toward God and man, in knowledge and in judgment, so that he may approve things that are excellent and may be found sincere and without offense on the day of Jesus Christ. Of course this implies the use of the means of grace. Cf. also Phil. 2:12 b. Thus the believer will be filled with fruits of righteousness, as Paul enumerates some of them (Gal. 5:22-24), not for his personal glorification, but for the glory and praise of God (v. 11).

C. Such certainty of salvation is a great comfort to the believer at all times, particularly in days of trials and tribulations, as Paul's experience, while writing this Epistle, shows, and should move the believer to thank God throughout his life (v. 3).

WALTER A. BAEPLER

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

PHIL. 3:17-21

As in his other letters, the Apostle lays the foundation of saving knowledge first. In this instance he had set forth in particular the glorious fruits of the resurrection of Christ as the foundation of every believer's knowledge of salvation,

with justification and sanctification most intimately connected and urging the Apostle to call out, v. 12, and to give the pledge for the future, vv. 13-15. And now follows the climax of his admonition, centering in the thought

OUR CITIZENSHIP IS IN HEAVEN

Therefore we should

I. Conduct ourselves in accordance with the Apostle's example

II. Prepare for the glories of the heavenly inheritance

I

The thought which governs the entire paragraph is evidently that chosen as our topic. This governs the Apostle's entire argument, as in Heb. 13:14. The plea particularly significant and effective in the case of the Philippian Christians because of their pride in being citizens of the Roman Empire. No matter how great the advantages and privileges which believers may enjoy here on earth, their foremost allegiance, beside which all others fade away into nothing, is that toward their Savior and His promise of heavenly glory. Therefore all Christians should conduct themselves in agreement with the Apostle's example. Why?

A. Because of the warning example offered by the conduct and fate of the enemies of the Cross (vv. 18-19). These people, of whom Paul speaks only with the deepest commiseration and sorrow, were enemies of the Gospel of the Cross. They would not accept for themselves, nor would they sanction, the preaching of the truth which the Apostle makes basic for all Christian teaching (1 Cor. 2:2). Such apostates and renegades made the work of the true Apostles in those days extremely difficult. But the Apostle knew that their end would be destruction, as a final punishment by the outraged God, because they served only earthly things. In spite of all show to the contrary, they did not give their wholehearted service to the Lord Jesus, but served their own selfish desires, interests, and goals.

B. On the other hand there was the stimulating example of the Apostle's life, to which he could point without undue boasting (2 Cor. 11:16 ff.). He could rightly call upon his readers to become imitators of himself, since he knew him-

self to be wholly devoted to the service of his Savior, to whom he owed everything that he held dear (vv. 8, 10). If all Christians will, at all times, keep the example of the Apostle Paul before their eyes, they will be properly prepared for their citizenship in heaven.

II

But since this citizenship is theirs by faith, through the grace of God and their Savior, therefore they will also strive, in the strength of the Lord, to prepare for the glories of the heavenly inheritance. Why?

A. Because we look forward to the glory of Christ in His second coming. No longer will He be in the form of a servant, in the lowliness of His humiliation. He will come as our triumphant King, as the Victor over all enemies. (Eschatological discourses.) His body, although still bearing the marks of His substitutionary sacrifice, will nevertheless be invested with the glory which He had with His Father before the world began (John 17:5). At His coming all believers may look up with joy, for their final redemption comes to them in Him.

B. Because our bodies, in the heavenly glory, will be fashioned like unto His glorious body (v. 21). We shall see our God and our Savior with the eyes of the body that we now have (Job 19:25-27), but everything that connects us with sin and the consequences of sin shall be taken from us (Rev. 21:4). He to whom we owe our life and being in the first place, will make use of His creative and governing power to make our bodies fit for the heavenly kingdom (2 Tim. 4:18). Then our citizenship will see its glorious fruition, when we shall see Him face to face and be with Him in everlasting happiness.

P. E. KRETZMANN

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

COL. 1: 9-14

A faithful Christian will pray "for all men" (1 Tim. 2:1). The contents of his prayer briefly are: "Thy Kingdom come." Particularly will the Christian pray for his congregation. Thanksgiving for God-given faith in Christ and petition for

spiritual growth for the pastor and the members (Col. 1:9). Whereas the first part of this chapter (v. 3 ff.) contains the thanksgiving, the words under consideration present

PAUL'S PRAYER AN EXAMPLE OF THE CHRISTIAN'S
PRAYER FOR HIS CONGREGATION

- | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>I. For more knowledge</i> | <i>III. For Christian patience</i> |
| <i>II. For a godlier life</i> | <i>IV. For a thankful spirit</i> |

I

"We," Paul and Timothy (v. 9 b). After thanking God for the gift of saving, fruitful, and hope-giving faith, Paul now desires for them more spiritual knowledge — "filled with the knowledge of His will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding" (v. 9 b). Paul recognized the subtle danger of losing sight of God's will concerning their soul's salvation (1 Tim. 2:4). This danger described in Col. 2:8. The antidote lies in greater knowledge, wisdom and spiritual understanding. Hence this prayer (Col. 2:7). How intense the loving concern of the Apostle for the Colossian Christians! What a challenge to them to search the Gospel!

Have we as a congregation need of more knowledge of God's will concerning our salvation? (2 Pet. 3:18.) There are so many things to delve into, so many fields of knowledge to divert and pervert our attention. Oh, the need of pleas like this! Oh, the need of congregations today to ask God for an increase in Christian knowledge, the knowledge of the Gospel. That is the real "dynamis" (Rom. 1:16), first and above all the dynamic of God unto salvation through faith in Christ and then also the power unto a godly life.

II

The Colossians had experienced the sanctifying power of God unto a godly life through the Gospel of Christ. There is to be no standstill. Hence Paul's prayer continues: "That ye might walk . . ." (v. 10). "Worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing." Not selfish, but selfless lives (2 Cor. 5:15). Service to fellow men (Matt. 20:26-27). "Fruitful unto every good work." As a tree watered and nourished well is to increase in production, so the Colossians (John 15:16 a; Phil. 1:11). This power not found in their natural being (Rom.

7:19). Without Christ-given power no fruits at all. God must give both the willingness and the doing of these works. So Paul prays for that very willingness and power for them. What a loving concern for them breathes in this plea! What a challenge to them to remain connected with the "power of God, the Gospel of Christ!"

God give us such praying Christians today, that there may be in these days of ever-increasing wickedness an increase within the Church of the fruits of the only saving faith.

III

Conditions then were such that much patience was needed. Persecutions from without. The irritation of weak brethren and sisters from within. But joyful patience and long-suffering not found in natural man, nor produced by own might. Therefore the next plea: "Strengthened with all might, according to His glorious power" (v. 11). How this prayer must have helped them to lift their eyes confidently unto the hills from which alone they could expect help for patience in persecution and for long-suffering in counteracting the provocations from their own ranks.

Conditions the same today for bold confessors of Christ and His Word of Truth. Persecuted by the world. Taunted by the weak in faith within the congregation. What a blessing, then, if pastor and members pray for joyful patience and longsuffering for themselves and their fellow members.

IV

Man's natural inclination is to grumble, complain. Colossians no exception. Hence Paul's prayer (v. 12). However, He does not list earthly, physical benefits, *e. g.*, health, prosperity, peace, etc. Rather as sources for a constantly thankful spirit he points to their God-given inheritance in heaven (v. 12 b); to their God-wrought conversion (v. 13); and to their redemption, the glorious forgiveness of sins through Christ, as the true and lasting source and reason for genuine thankfulness. Compare Eph. 5:20: "in the name of the Lord Jesus."

We also need such pleas for thankful hearts. Christians can use the same reasons today for rousing gratitude, because these blessings are constant and unchangeable.

"Ye have not, because ye ask not" (James 4:2). This applies to both pastors and members. "Ask, and it shall be given you" (Matt. 7:7), however, applies with equal force. God grant us praying Christians after the example of a Paul for Jesus' sake.

EDWIN H. PFLUG

TWENTY-FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

1 THESS. 4:13-18

Scripture teaches a resurrection of all the dead (John 5:28; Matt. 25:32). The purpose of resurrection is twofold, either unto life or unto damnation (John 5:29; Matt. 25:32b-46). St. Paul bent every effort to attain unto the resurrection of life (Phil. 3:7-14). In order to inspire us to the same unwavering faith in our Redeemer and to like zeal in holiness and good works, let us direct our attention to

THE GLORY OF OUR RESURRECTION

It is

- I. Glorious in its nature II. Glorious in its comfort*
III. Glorious in its certainty

I

The marvelous glory of the resurrection unto life is described vv. 16-17.

A. The Lord Christ Himself shall descend from heaven, not in humility and poverty, in the form of a servant, but as the Lord and King of heaven and earth, riding on the clouds as on His royal chariot, surrounded by the innumerable hosts of heavenly spirits (Matt. 25:31; 26:64). He shall come "with a shout" of authoritative command; "with the voice of the archangel" (cp. Jude 9; Rev. 12:7), the ruler, under Christ, of the heavenly host accompanying (Matt. 25:31); "with the trump of God." The shout, the voice, the trump, all have but one purpose—Arise, awake, ye saints of the Lord!

B. "And the dead in Christ shall arise." From their graves, wherever they may be, on land or in the sea, they will come forth, not in their sinful, mortal bodies, but glorified (Phil. 3:21; 1 Cor. 15:42 ff.). Those still living will then be changed (1 Cor. 15:51) and, together with those revived,

will be caught up in the clouds, the chariots sent by the Lord to His brethren and sisters, to meet with the Lord in the air. What a happy meeting that will be! (Cp. 1 Pet. 1:8.) And then the Lord of Glory, the Captain of our salvation, and all the vast multitude of believers (Rev. 7:9) will be led by God Himself (text, v. 14), into the very presence of the Lord of Hosts, to the home prepared for us, to glory unspeakable (Heb. 2:10; John 17:3-4; John 17:24). All this shall happen "in the twinkling of an eye" (1 Cor. 15:52), for there shall be no more time; then we are in eternity.

Thus shall the Lamb upon the throne (Rev. 5:6) and we with Him reap the final and full fruits of His victory on Calvary (1 Cor. 15:54-57; cp. Rev. 5:11-14). What an incentive to unswerving, loyal faith!

II

The Apostle's purpose in reminding us of this glorious doctrine is stated vv. 13, 18.

A. "Others" includes all non-Christian religions. They have no hope (v. 13; Eph. 2:12). Point out the hopeless views of paganism, Christian Science, Jehovah's Witnesses, Modernism, etc. They mourn either in stoic resignation or in despairing wailings, raving against cruel fate, blaspheming God.

B. Christians feel keenly and mourn sincerely the death of their loved ones; Lazarus' sisters (John 11:31-33); Jesus (v. 36); Paul (Phil. 2:27). Yet Christians have the hope of the resurrection unto life. This tempers their sorrow, enables them to say: John 11:24; Job 1:21; 19:25-27; Rom. 14:8-9. Death is gain for the believer (Phil. 1:21). They are asleep (vv. 13-15); they rest from their labors (Rev. 14:13). What a gain! Cp. *Lutheran Hymnal*, 589. And on that day the dead will not be at a disadvantage. Those living will not "prevent," precede, come before, them in any wise. The dead in Christ shall rise first, before the glorification of the living, and only then they together shall meet the Lord. Let this comfort sink deep into our hearts, whenever the death of our beloved ones or thoughts of our own death seek to disturb our minds.

III

Is that hope certain? If anything, then the Christian's hope of a resurrection unto life everlasting is sure and certain.

A. The Apostle voices not his own views and speculations. "These words" (v. 18) are the word of the Lord (v. 15) and therefore absolutely reliable (2 Cor. 1:20). There is a resurrection unto life!

B. It is God who will bring those asleep back to life. This God is omnipresent. He is with us and we in Him in life and in death, in the grave (Acts 17:28). He is omniscient. He knows exactly what becomes of every particle into which our bodies disintegrate. And He is not a disinterested spectator. "Whether we live," etc. (Rom. 14:8-9). He knows that these are the particles which He has promised to re-assemble into our body, no matter how far they may be scattered, and which He has promised to re-unite with our soul. And He is almighty. Not even this thing is too hard for Him, the Creator and Preserver of heaven and earth (Is. 40:22, 26, 28). This God will raise me from the dead unto life eternal.

He will do that through Jesus (v. 14). That was the purpose for which Jesus was sent to be our Redeemer, for which He lived and died and rose again, that there might be a resurrection out of death to everlasting life. And therefore those who sleep in Jesus will God bring unto Him. This is most certainly true.

Comfort one another and yourselves with these words and cling to this Jesus and to this God in true faith, in sincere love, in willing service.

TH. LAETSCH



Theological Observer

A Tribute to the Sainted Dr. M. Willkomm. — In the *Theologische Quartalschrift* of July Dr. P. Peters of Thiensville, Wis., writes about the life and work of his former colleague at Neuzehlendorf Dr. Martin Willkomm, who entered the heavenly rest last spring. Our readers will be grateful for the words of appreciation and love of Dr. Peters, and we herewith reprint them.

"The Ev. Lutheran Free Church of Germany has suffered a grievous loss in the death of Dr. Karl Martin Willkomm on the 1st of June, 1946. While its ranks have been thinned by the enlistment and the captivity and even the death of a number of its pastors, still the loss of its outstanding theologian in a time when very far-reaching discussions are being carried on with the other Free Churches of Germany will be deeply felt by our brethren overseas and by those of us who are aware of the valuable service which Dr. Willkomm by the grace of God has rendered the Free Church and the Synodical Conference. As members of the Wisconsin Synod we will not fail to recall and to remember that Dr. Willkomm has been the theological teacher of all the pastors of our Poland Mission.

"Born in India, January 23, 1876, he came to Germany when his sainted father, the Rev. Dr. O. Willkomm, severed his connections with the Leipzig Mission and the Saxon State Church for confessional reasons and was called to serve congregations in Germany belonging to the Saxon Free Church, of which he later became president. In Niederplanitz, Saxony, our Dr. Willkomm attended the parish school and then the local *Gymnasium*, from which he graduated with high honors. He then came to America to receive his theological training at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis. In 1898 he was ordained and installed as assistant pastor in Planitz. From 1905—1919 he served the Free Church congregation at Muelhausen in Alsace and then succeeded his father as pastor of St. John's Congregation in Planitz. As President of the Free Church of Saxony and Other States Dr. Willkomm on the 15th of November, 1922, dedicated the Seminary buildings at Berlin-Zehlendorf to the service of the Triune God and on October 2, 1923, was called as *Director* of this theological seminary. Here he served the Church for twenty-two years as professor of Dogmatics and Church History, as editor of the church paper, *Die Ev.-Luth. Freikirche*, and of the theological journal, *Schrift und Bekenntnis*, and finally as author of various writings, especially on our Lutheran Confessions. (Cf. April number, 1946, of the *Quartalschrift*, p. 148.) June 7, 1934, the Faculty of Concordia Seminary conferred on its alumnus the honorary title of Doctor of Divinity. The last, and certainly not the least valuable, service which Dr. Willkomm rendered the Free Church, for which he had so often entered the lists against attacks of the state churches,

was to write his comments on the theses which formed the basis of the discussions carried on with the Breslau Free Church. In a letter written to the undersigned on April 29, 1946, he mentions that he and his wife had left the Hindenburg Hospital in Kleinmachnow, where the Lord had granted them, to use his own words, '*eine Zuflucht fuer den Winter*,' and had returned to their former dwelling in one of the bombed buildings on the seminary grounds, and then adds: 'Students have not yet arrived; still we hope that some will come again.' Untiring in his labors for the Free Church and its theological school, he had cherished the hope of beginning a new semester and of welcoming the first postwar students, although he would have had to do it in great bodily weakness, of which he speaks in his letter, and in the midst of the ruins which World War II had wrought. His Lord willed otherwise. Suffering for years from a heart ailment, Dr. Willkomm died of a stroke. His work was done in the *ecclesia militans* and the *ecclesia pressa* when his Lord thus called him home. 'Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them' (Rev. 14:13). R. I. P." A.

Pastors' School at Seward.—From June 24 to July 12 Concordia Teachers College, Seward, Nebr., this year conducted its third pastors' school as a part of the regular summer session of the institution. Courses specially designed for pastors were a Greek reading course of the book of Acts and a seminar on the Church. These studies were under the direction of Dr. William Arndt of St. Louis and President A. O. Fuerbringer of Seward. In addition, the pastors enrolled in other courses offered during the term. Among these were psychology of adolescence, rural sociology, and public relations and publicity.

The seminar on the Church had a full-time enrollment of twenty-two men, and several others audited part time. It was chiefly an exegetical study of the Scripture texts which contain the doctrine of the Church. Many hours were spent in the library and the seminar room in examining these texts. In addition the class divided itself into groups of two men each who jointly wrote papers on the following topics: The Position of the Teacher, Deaconess, and Missionary; Who Were the Weak Christians of Rom. 14 and 1 Cor. 8:10?; *Sola Scriptura* and Legalism; Rom. 16:17 f.; Unionism and Separatism; The Application of the Law of Love in the Life of the Church; Prayer Fellowship; What Is Divisive of Church Fellowship?; The Social Gospel; the Church and Higher Education.

The complete summaries of the studies on the Church are being printed under the title *What Is the Church? The Biblical Concept and Its Application to the Present Scene*. Copies may be ordered from Prof. A. Fuerbringer. Price, 75 cents.

H. F. WERLING

Lutheran World Convention Plans.—From R. N. S. we take over the following report:

"The first postwar meeting of the Lutheran World Convention, co-operative agency for Lutheran churches in 28 countries, will take place at Lund, South Sweden, June 24—29, 1947, it was disclosed at the conclusion of a three-day meeting of the Convention's executive committee at Uppsala, Sweden. The meeting was presided over by Archbishop Erling Eidem, Primate of the Swedish Lutheran Church, and marked the first time the group has met officially since 1939.

"The meeting announced that a proposed constitution for the Lutheran World Convention, which was organized at Eisenach, Germany, in 1923, will be submitted for adoption at the Lund assembly.

"The constitution calls for changing the name of the Lutheran World Convention to the Lutheran World Federation and provides for enlarging the executive committee from 12 to 16 members. Membership of the committee would be divided into four groups, comprising a western, or American; a northern, or Scandinavian; a central, or German; and a new minority, or Asia, group.

"The Federation would function through an executive committee meeting every year, and a general assembly convoked every five years.

"Officers elected at the executive committee's meeting at Copenhagen last December were confirmed at the Uppsala sessions, with Archbishop Erling Eidem of Sweden as president, Prof. Olaf Moe of Norway as first vice-president, and Dr. S. C. Michelfelder of the United States as executive secretary. In addition, Dr. Abdehl Ross Wentz, chairman of the American section of the L. W. C., was named as second vice-president.

"A proposal for representation in the World Council of Churches on a confessional rather than a geographical basis was adopted unanimously by the executive committee. It will be submitted to the arrangements committee of the World Council at a session in London during the first week of August.

"Confessional representation was urged by American members of the L. W. C.'s executive committee because the Lutheran bodies in America believe that Lutherans of the world should be recognized in the World Council as a denominational unit.

"Delegates to the meeting included representatives of Lutheran churches in the United States, Sweden, Finland, Norway, and Denmark. Two German delegates who were prevented by transportation difficulties from arriving in time for the meeting were Dr. Karl Ihmels and Dr. Ernest Sommerlath, both of Leipzig, in the Russian occupation zone.

Major discussions at the meeting concerned plans for aiding needy Lutheran churches in war-affected countries, increased spiritual opportunities for the Church, and collaboration with

churches of other denominations through the World Council of Churches."

It should be added that Bishop Meiser of Bavaria attended a part of the meeting, having arrived late. A.

Brenz's Smaller Catechism. — *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* (July, 1946) publishes among other fine articles also a brief explanation of Brenz's Smaller Catechism, which it then offers in a very readable English translation. Of the *Catechismus Minor* of Brenz it says that it "is a brief erotematic compendium, comprising in the German version twenty-two and in the Latin translation twenty-three questions and answers. The five Chief Parts are treated in the succession: Baptism, Creed, Commandments, Prayer, Supper." It adds (we quote only a few statements): "Following the appearance, in 1529, of Luther's *Small Catechism*, Brenz prepared, in 1535, a new catechism, which was even briefer than his earlier work and which treated the Chief Parts in the order: Baptism, Creed, Prayer, Commandments, Supper, and added a sixth, 'Of the Office of the Keys.' Through its incorporation in the Wuerttemberg Church Orders this became the official catechism of the duchy. In the Wuerttemberg Order of 1559 catechetical training in the church and in the *Volksschule* go hand in hand, each reinforcing the other." We heartily congratulate the *Quarterly* for digging out of oblivion this important piece of Lutheran catechetical literature. At the same time, a comparison of Brenz's and Luther's catechisms shows how much more valuable the latter was both in the arrangement of subjects and in the wealth of subject material. Recently the Augustana Synod resolved to publish important writings of Luther in handy form for popular use. A *Zurueck zu Luther* movement will certainly be of great benefit to the Lutheran Church in the United States.

J. T. M.

Missionary Aviation Becomes Reality. — *The Lutheran Herald* (August 6, 1946) reports: "The Lutheran World Convention's pioneering venture in missionary aviation became a reality early in July when its renovated C-47 transport plane took to the airways from Shanghai on two important flights in behalf of Protestant missions. The plane, acquired last spring from the U.S. Foreign Liquidation Commission by Dr. Daniel Nelson, the LWC's relief director in China, was completely overhauled and put in first-class condition before taking off on its initial flight on July 4, to carry relief supplies from Shanghai to Haichow in Kiangsu Province. Its second trip was made on July 8, when supplies and equipment were moved to Cheloo Christian University at Tsinan in Shantung Province. At the controls was young Dick Rossie, one of the leading aces in the Pacific theater of operations during the war. Early in August the C-47 will wing its way to Calcutta, India, with a full passenger list, consisting of Scandinavian missionaries in China who have not had a furlough for nearly a decade. Because air travel is the cheapest, quickest, and

safest mode of travel in China today, the Lutheran World Convention appropriated \$40,000 for the purchase, repair, and operation of the plane. It will be used principally to repatriate missionaries in isolated areas of China, but will also be available to other Protestant groups on a rental basis, which is expected to pay the original cost of the project." The world keeps moving on. At its last convention the Southern District of our own Church allowed the Florida delegates plane fare to attend the conventions held at New Orleans, since traveling by air was found to be both quick and inexpensive.

J. T. M.

Luther Still Living.—President Cl. E. Hoopmann of our sister synod in Australia announced in the *Australian Lutheran* (June 26, 1946) the completion of "the Martin Luther Series" of six booklets. In view of the fact that recently also the Augustana Synod at its regular convention resolved to publish Luther's writings in tract form, this is interesting news. President Hoopmann writes as follows: "The Martin Luther Series' of six booklets has now been completed. The last booklet of the series to appear is *The Liberty of a Christian*. These booklets, available at our Publishing Company, should be read by our members and handed on to others. There is no doubt about it that Lutherans in Australia could do much more to make Luther and the doctrine he taught known to others. We are not always conscious of our glorious heritage and the opportunities we have of inducing others to share with us the blessings of this heritage. As I was recently perusing the February 15 issue of the 'Church's Oldest Newspaper' in England, *The Record*, kindly sent me by Pastor H. Noack, I was struck by the prominence and space given to Luther and his work. A lengthy article dealt with 'Justification in Luther's Theology.' A large and striking advertisement announcing meetings in London to commemorate the fourth centenary of the great Reformer's death was headed: 'The Solitary Monk Who Shook the World.' The first celebration advertised was the one in St. Paul's Cathedral on February 18. Then followed advertisements of services and celebrations to be held on other days of the same week, including an important rally at Westminster Chapel on Thursday, February 21. At this celebration the Rev. E. Gordon Rupp, M. A., B. D., the author of *Martin Luther: Hitler's Cause or Cure*, was the principal speaker. The book by Gordon Rupp is a reply to Peter Weiner's despicable *Martin Luther: Hitler's Spiritual Ancestor*. The *Church Times* calls Rupp's book 'a masterful refutation' of the book by Weiner. The *British Weekly* writes of the same book: 'A completely devastating exposure of Mr. Weiner's offenses against history and the republic of letters. This book is not only an excellent piece of literary criticism; it reveals a scholar with a real knowledge of the great German reformer and his writings.' Brethren, let us never be ashamed of Luther and the doctrine which he taught. It was the doctrine of St. Paul, the doctrine of Christ. Let us

study Luther: his life and work. Truly, he was able to say in words taken from his favorite Psalm: 'I shall not die, but live, and declare the works of the Lord' (Ps. 118:7)." J. T. M.

Starving Europe. — In the *Australian Theological Review* (March 30, 1946), Dr. Hamann quotes "with a feeling of distinct pleasure" an article which appeared in the *Australian Christian World* (Jan. 18, 1946). It reads: "The Upper House of the Convocation unanimously adopted the following resolution, moved by the Bishop of Chichester (Dr. Bell) and seconded by the Bishop of Birmingham (Dr. Barnes): This House deplores the expulsion of German families in the eastern parts of Germany and the Sudetenland from their homes and occupations as a violation of the principles of humanity that the Allies are pledged to uphold; it hopes that his Majesty's Government will continue to make representations to the Governments of Russia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia to end these miseries and will do all it can, in co-operation with the United States of America, to sustain those who enter our zone of occupation; it calls on all Churchmen to support the Government in these endeavors and to accept continued restriction in imports and rations in order to release transport, coal, and food during the coming winter for the peoples of Europe.

"Dr. Bell said that one of the most terrible crimes of the past twelve years had been the expulsion from their homes of human beings in vast numbers, because of their race or nationality. The crime was started by the Germans long before the war and was perpetrated against Jews and non-Aryan Christians. It was continued during the war, when able-bodied men were transported for forced labor. The terrible process was still being continued, only now the perpetrators were our Allies. Those affected were, in the main, the poor, the old, and women and children, to the number of at least nine million; most probably twelve million.

"The Archbishop of Canterbury, supporting the resolution, said that there was a cause for the re-ordering of population in some parts of Europe, but no one in the House could regard with anything but horror the way in which these deportations had been made, without the possibility of providing the decencies of life for those removed, and with the certainty that millions were bound to perish."

From an item headed "Jewish Appeal for Germans" Dr. Hamann next quotes the following:

"At a meeting in London arranged by the 'Save the Children Fund' Mr. Victor Gollancz, the publisher, speaking as a Jew and 'as a man of the Left since the age of six,' made a moving appeal on behalf of the starving and homeless millions of Germans. While children were fainting from undernourishment elsewhere in Europe, he said, in Germany children were falling down dead, not only in the streets of Berlin, but on the awful trek from the East. 'I am a Jew,' declared Mr. Gollancz, 'and six million out of sixteen million of my people have been massacred by the Nazis.

I have no particular reason to be tender towards the Germans, but I do not understand how a child of three can be responsible for what Herr Hitler did. I do not see how an ignorant peasant woman in Silesia can be more responsible for the sins of the German Government than an agricultural laborer in an English village. And even if she were responsible, is that any reason for behaving like Nazis? Is that a decent thing for a Western civilized Christian country to do?"

These expressions, coming from men against whom no charge of prejudice can be raised, are all the more valuable since, as Professor Hamann points out, "very similar utterances recently printed in a Lutheran publication were the signal for a rather unintelligible attack in the public press and in a book printed in Australia."

J. T. M.

Religious Conditions in Slovakia and Hungary.—60,000 Slovak Lutheran repatriates from Hungary are being resettled in areas where there is a serious shortage of pastors, according to Dr. J. Hutchison Cockburn, director of the Department of Reconstruction and Interchurch Aid of the World Council of Churches, who has returned from a visit to Slovakia. "The Slovak Lutherans," Dr. Cockburn declared, "are being settled in Roman Catholic areas, where there is not only a shortage of Lutheran pastors but also of Lutheran churches." He declared that the Slovak Reformed Church, which has mostly Hungarian clergymen, also has an inadequate number of pastors as a result of an agreement for the exchange of 100,000 Slovaks from Hungary to Slovakia and vice versa. Dr. Cockburn said that many Slovak Reformed ministers have gone to Hungary, but none has come from Hungary to replace them. He reported that many clergymen are taking care of several parishes and that the Church is considering training laymen to help alleviate the shortage of ordained ministers. The World Council executive said moderate elements in Slovakia are hopeful that permission will be given Hungarian Protestants to hold services in Hungarian rather than Slovak. Dr. Cockburn announced that the reconstruction department this year has sent \$35,000 in funds to Czechoslovakia for interdenominational church aid, and has promised to send an additional \$70,000 for youth camps and Christian institutions. The department, he said, also sent \$30,000 to the Czech Brethren Church and expects to forward another \$20,000. Gifts of more than \$20,000 have been received from American Lutherans and Congregationalists to be channeled through the World Council for the benefit of coreligionists in Czechoslovakia. — R. N. S.

Books and the Book.—In his "Theological Table-Talk" in *Theology Today* (July, 1946) Dr. Hugh T. Kerr, Jr., calls attention to the fact that while the Bible is still the best seller, it may soon forfeit its place of pre-eminence, the *Reader's Digest* being one of a number of contenders for that honor. Other investigation has shown that while there were more requests for the Bible than

for any other book, *Forever Amber* and *A Tree Grows in Brooklyn* were close rivals. In fact, the survey concludes that "the reading of the Bible was equalled, if not surpassed," by popular novels. Other investigators, however, believe that regardless of the sale of the Bible itself, Biblical references and allusions are increasing in number in contemporary literature of all kinds. In a survey of "more than twelve thousand pages of American poetry published between 1930 and 1938 . . . the 1930's show an increase of 50 per cent over the 1920's in Biblical references." (Quotations from L. E. Nelson's *Our Roving Bible*.) Dr. Kerr suggests that this might constitute "a statistics of more profound significance than the mere mathematical calculation of the number of Bibles printed, distributed, and sold within a given period." Another important fact is mentioned in Dr. Kerr's editorial. While *Forever Amber* and *A Tree Grows in Brooklyn* were widely read, also books with a definite religious background such as *The Robe*, *The Keys of the Kingdom*, and *The Apostle* proved remarkable best sellers. The whole subject is certainly one that merits much thought.

J. T. M.

"Theology Today" and the Revised Standard New Testament. Floyd V. Filson closes an excellent article on the Revised Standard New Testament in *Theology Today* (July, 1946) with the following significant words: "The final verdict on the R. S. V. will be given not by scholars and critics but by the working leaders and faithful members of the Church. For the present, the novelty of the version guarantees it wide attention. In the long run the Church as a whole must decide whether it is the best help in worship, teaching, and study. No one expects the A. V. (Authorized Version) to be dropped from use; indeed, it may be recalled that the A. V., like many other versions, needed some time to win its way and was revised somewhat in the process; we cannot therefore expect the verdict on the R. S. V. to be given in a year. But when the Old Testament is complete and the full R. S. V. is available, the decision will then rest with the Church. A study of the New Testament portion of the work warrants two conclusions: first, that further minor revision to give a more consistent rendering of the Greek is desirable and, second, that such an improved R. S. V. will have a real chance to win the favor of a majority of the Church." Certainly, a very fair and sane view to take of the new version.

J. T. M.

Le Tourneau and Christian Education.—In the *Sunday School Times* (July 20, 1946) Ernest Gordon reports that the well-known Christian industrialist Le Tourneau has opened a new plant in East Texas, and in connection with it the "Le Tourneau Technical Institute of Texas," with a faculty of teachers in mathematics, mechanical drawing, chemistry, electricity, thermodynamics, physics, and metallurgy. Students will be able to support themselves by working eight hours daily in the plant. Mr. Gordon quotes Le Tourneau as saying: "Our student workers

will be taught by the best teachers and shop instructors that good pay can provide. . . . Finally, Le Tourneau Tech will not neglect the most important phase of education. Students will have regular classes for study of the Word of God and every encouragement through chapel services and other means to accept the Lord Jesus Christ as Savior and to learn from Him." Dr. Gordon comments on this: "What a rebuke this is to those unbelieving theologians who have perverted Christian schools and sterilized Bible teaching in hundreds of institutions in the United States!"

J. T. M.

Philip E. Howard of the "Sunday School Times." — On Saturday morning, June 22, 1946, there was called to his eternal rest Philip E. Howard, Sr., president of the *Sunday School Times* since 1903, when he succeeded Dr. Henry Clay Trumbull. He joined the *Sunday School Times* in 1891, when he had graduated from the University of Pennsylvania, and thus served it for fifty-five years. He was born in Lynn, Mass., on April 1, 1870, and became known in the course of time for his deep devotion to his Savior, which manifested itself radiantly in the articles he wrote for the *Times*. He also wrote or compiled fifteen books; among these his *The Life Story of Henry Clay Trumbull*, written in 1905 and perhaps his greatest work. Under his care and that of his co-workers the *Sunday School Times* ably and ceaselessly defended the fundamentals of the Christian faith and thus became a haven for good in thousands of homes when Modernism sought to destroy the Christian faith in so many churches. Early on Wednesday, June 19, there died also a valuable helper of Dr. Howard, Dr. E. J. Pace, who supplied the *Times* with more than fifteen hundred "Christian cartoons," most of which were hortatory or consolatory. Dr. Pace was sixty-six years old when he departed this life. J. T. M.

Yugoslavia and the World Council of Churches. — Conditions in Yugoslavia are pictured vividly in an article submitted by R. N. S.; hence we print it here. It comes from Geneva. — For the first time since the outbreak of the war a representative of the World Council of Churches has succeeded in establishing personal contact with churches in Yugoslavia. He is Dr. Paul Neff Garber, American-born Methodist Bishop in Europe, who has arrived here to report on conferences with Serbian church leaders. Dr. Garber said he interviewed representatives of the Serbian Orthodox Church, and of Reformed, Methodist, Baptist, and Salvation Army groups, in an effort to set up an interdenominational reconstruction committee similar to agencies established in other countries, but added, "I am not sure as to how successful I was." He disclosed that Serbian church leaders are anxious to receive much-needed material and spiritual aid, even indirectly, from the United States and Great Britain, but are fearful lest they open themselves to charges of "collaborating with western reactionaries." Dr. Garber recalled that the Yugoslavian constitution specifically guarantees religious freedom, but said that although

worship services are being held openly, the churches suffer from "difficulties from other sources." As examples he cited the internment of German nationals, which has "virtually ended Lutheranism in Yugoslavia except among Yugoslavs," and the closing of many Methodist and other churches. He disclosed that the Government has requisitioned the Methodist tuberculosis sanatorium at Novi Sad and is running it as a state institution. During his stay in the country, Dr. Garber added, Salvation Army work was brought to a standstill by government requisitioning of the Army's buildings for storage purposes. "Because all instruction is in state hands," Dr. Garber declared, "there are no Sunday schools. Church-state relations are delicate at present, and this is especially true of the Serbian Orthodox Church, which anti-Tito forces are charged with having sought to exploit."

Resumption of Work by European Evangelistic Society.—From Indianapolis, Ind., via R. N. S., comes the following information: Resumption of work by the European Evangelistic Society, a voluntary Disciples of Christ group organized in 1935 to combat Nazism with Christian principles, is being planned here, Prof. Dean E. Walter of the Butler University School of Religion announced. Professor Walter said the group will be incorporated as a formal body, and final plans for its work will be adopted at the international convention of the Disciples of Christ Aug. 6—11 at Columbus, Ohio. An exploratory commission will be sent to Europe to discover the most productive areas for the Society's work, Professor Walter said. The Society hopes to get in touch with former members suppressed during the Hitler regime and to find out what can be done to assist in the rehabilitation of Christians in Europe.

Organization of Protestant Episcopal Church.—When the General Convention (of the Protestant Episcopal Church) meets in Philadelphia on Sept. 10, the deputies will be representing 74 dioceses and 29 missionary districts of the Church. The convention meets triennially. The *Living Church* (Protestant Episcopal) states: "Since 1786 General Convention has met regularly every three years, and while it has seen many changes and developments, its basic organization has remained the same. From the time the Church had enough bishops to form a separate house, General Convention has been a bicameral body. While joint sessions are frequently held, all legislation is adopted by the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies sitting separately. On important matters the House of Deputies is further separated in voting, when the tally is made by dioceses and orders. Thus all legislation requires the consent of all three of the elements of the Church—the bishops, the clerical deputies, and the lay deputies. And since all of these are elected by the dioceses (except missionary bishops, who are elected by the House of Bishops), the government of the Church is a truly democratic one." The last sentence requires comment. While we do not

wish to say that an episcopalian organization of the Church is forbidden by Scripture, we hold that the congregational system which we follow in the Lutheran Church in America is in keeping with the example of the early apostolic Church. A.

E. Stanley Jones on the Prospect of Missions in India.— Developments in India are followed with deep interest by all friends of Christian missions. Will India soon be an independent country? And if so, what will be the status of the missions conducted there by European and American Christians? Writing in the *Christian Century*, E. Stanley Jones takes an optimistic view of the future with respect to Christian missions if independence should come to India. He states, "To those who declare that minorities, especially the Christian minority, will be persecuted in the new India, I reply: There will be no such persecution. In its Karachi session the Congress set up a bill of rights guaranteeing religious freedom and the protection of minorities. That bill has been reaffirmed. A few months ago, when a mob got out of hand in Calcutta and partially burned the Methodist church, Abul Kalam Azad, the Moslem president of the All-India Congress party, called on the pastor, expressed his regret, and suggested that the Congress be allowed to restore the church as a pledge that all religious minorities will be secure under independence and all places of worship respected. The All-India Christian Association decided to ally themselves with the Indian National Congress. The private secretaries of both Gandhi and Nehru are Christians." Dr. Jones thinks that no one will be kept from embracing the Christian faith if he desires to do so. He reports that Acharya Kripalani, secretary of the Congress party, stated that conversions to Christianity will not be forbidden in the projected state, adding that he was speaking not merely as an individual, but as secretary of the Congress party and was expressing its position. Let us hope that Dr. Jones is not seeing things in too rosy a light. A.

Great Britain and the Palestine Question.— A correspondent of the *Christian Century*, writing from London, has this to say on views expressed in England concerning the Palestine issue: "Palestine is still a serious concern—one not to be solved, many are saying, by processions and banners with provocative slogans. The Archbishop of Canterbury has spoken the general mind of the Christian Church on the matter. He declared that those who try to confuse the government's action with anti-Semitism are guilty of a great disservice to the public interest both in England and in Palestine. It is true, he pointed out, that a clear indication of Palestine's future is greatly needed. 'The real problem,' he said, 'is that of the 500,000 and more Jews and all other displaced persons in Germany. That problem cries out for a solution, and there is little sign of urgency in dealing with it. And yet, if the united nations combined to solve it, if every country were willing according to its capacity to give asylum for some, it would be

solved.' " — At this writing the daily press reports on the Palestinian situation are alarming. The issue seems to revolve not on the aspirations of Zionism, but on economic and social considerations. A.

Modernists and Christian Terminology. — *The Presbyterian* (August 15, 1946) offers the following interesting editorial, showing the deceitfulness which Liberals practice when using the traditional Christian terminology. We read: "In the *Christian Century* an inquirer asks of Dr. Morrison, the editor, what he means by the word 'resurrection.' Dr. Morrison answers that he is not concerned to know whether Jesus after the 'resurrection' appeared in a resuscitated physical body or in some other form. He continues: 'On the whole, I am inclined to stand with Paul, who denied the resuscitation concept and based his argument on the concept of a *spiritual body*.' This is an astonishing statement. Where is the Scripture passage in which Paul denied the 'resuscitation concept,' the concept that Jesus rose from the dead in His physical body? I cannot find it. It is not there. Paul's aim in 1 Corinthians 15 is first to prove the historical fact that Jesus rose from the dead, as the basis for our expectation that we too shall rise; then he declares that at our resurrection our bodies shall be 'changed.' But in proving the fact that Jesus rose, he brings forward the testimony of those to whom the risen Christ appeared. Exactly what was that testimony? We have it in the Gospels, three of which were written within ten or twelve years after Paul wrote his Epistle; and in the Book of Acts; and in certain other Epistles. Acts was certainly written in the late sixties; and the Epistles date from A.D. 52 to the late sixties. Put their testimony together and the only reasonable conclusion is that these men and women were convinced that Jesus had risen from the dead in the same body He had worn before death. Some of them were in the upper room when He, appearing, demonstrated to their terrified eyes and hands that He was not a spirit, but the same Jesus they had known, in the same body. The only way to nullify such evidence is to deny the historicity and authenticity of the documents containing it. As for me, I accept the New Testament documents with their implications." A fine testimony to the truth of Scripture against the flippant and false use of Christian terminology of which Modernists make themselves guilty. J. T. M.

News from the International Convention of Jehovah's Witnesses. — Early in August Jehovah's Witnesses held a convention in Cleveland on which *Religious News Service* submits this report:

"Sixty thousand Jehovah's Witnesses from many countries attending the international convention here received instructions at afternoon and night rallies on courtroom procedure, theocratic ministry, and door-to-door canvassing techniques.

"Hayden C. Covington, head of the sect's legal department at Brooklyn, N. Y., headquarters, urged that the Witnesses prepare

their own defense cases carefully before going to court if arrested on 'fabricated charges such as preaching without a license or failure to obtain certain permits.'

"Covington, reviewing court conduct rules, demanded the Witnesses maintain dignity, speak loudly, and show zeal by quoting Scriptures in their defense.

"The society's suspended daily convention paper, the *Messenger*, out of print since the international convention in Columbus, Ohio, in 1937, was introduced at the convention by Grant Suiter, convention chairman.

"Suiter called the *Messenger* the 'only way truth about Jehovah's Witnesses can be carried to the people.' He charged the public press, while currently considerate of the Witnesses in what was published by Cleveland papers, had failed in its duty of telling the truth and giving accurate information.

"The *Messenger* was sold to the general membership at all exits of the Municipal Stadium as they left the rally. Cost was five cents a copy or three for ten cents. Witnesses could sell or give these away to the general public, Suiter said. He announced 100,000 copies would be printed daily, but if the demand occurred, 'we'll print 200,000 or more.'

"Municipal and civic organizations received a number of complaints during the day when no flag was seen flying over the Stadium. Witness officials asserted they thought the Stadium management was taking care of flag display. Paul J. Hurd, Stadium commissioner, reported no one had requested the flag be removed. He said the flags on the Stadium and Public Hall would fly the next day.

"An army of 50,000 trained Witnesses began a person-to-person evangelistic campaign of the Cleveland area to spread their beliefs.

"N. H. Knorr, president of the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society and head of the Witnesses, said, 'We're not looking for new members, we only want to teach people the Bible.'

"For a radius of 20 miles from Public Square the Cleveland district was divided into 11,773 territories, convention officials said. Teams of three to five persons were assigned to canvass every person in each territory.

"General reaction of the public to the increasing pressure of Jehovah's Witnesses' evangelistic campaign was one of tolerant amusement. There were, however, several minor disturbances in the downtown area when enthusiastic Witness literature sellers persisted in trying to sell their material to passersby. Corner salesmen were pushed by angered pedestrians. Several young men Witnesses were jeered and called 'draft dodgers' by women."

A Liberal Son of a Pious Mother.—Recently there appeared an interesting book, *A Frontier Lady*, by Sarah Royce; edited by Ralph Henry Gabriel, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. From this remarkable diary, from which Ernest Gordon in the

Sunday School Times (May 18, 1946) quotes enough to show that Sarah Royce was an outstanding Christian, upon whose strong faith and constant prayer depended the safety of her difficult trek to California in those early years when only few who ventured the arduous trip to the Golden State reached the West Coast. She believed in a prayer-answering God. She started with an ox team from Iowa — she, her young husband, and their small daughter Mary. Others joined along the way and broke away again. Every imaginable evil befell them on their long way — cholera, numerous attacks of hostile Indians, lack of water, want of food, the unbearable heat, and dust, and the like. During the long journey she never for a moment lost her faith in the providing God, never omitted prayer. In due time the family reached the West Coast where they made their home. Here, after some years, there was born to Mr. and Mrs. Royce a son, who as Professor Royce of Harvard became internationally famous as a scholar. Mr. Gordon writes of him: "Professor Royce of Harvard was a man much talked of in his day. He had a prodigious head set on an undersized frame and filled with a prodigious store of knowledge. His life was spent in discussion and analysis without coming to any definite conclusions so far as the man on the street would know. A few phrases survive him — 'loyalty,' 'the beloved community,' which many have heard and few can define. Of Christ and His work he never cared to speak, and of God he may have made some theoretical definition apart from revelation, but owing nothing to revelation. My recollection of him at this point is of his quoting in Latin with a quizzical expression the beginning of the Fifty-third Psalm "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God,' almost in a manner to indicate that the fool was not altogether mistaken. . . . As a distinguished Californian professor, Royce was asked by a publishing house to write the story of California in a series of State histories. . . . It was at that time that he induced his mother to set down an account of her experiences of the overland journey in an oxcart to the Golden State. It was a remarkable manuscript, remarkable not only for the thrilling episodes of the long journey, but above all for the Christian faith and courage which runs through the whole account like a scarlet thread. Professor Royce wrote a little introduction to his mother's story. It was preceded by a preface from a Yale professor in history who thought it incumbent on him to contrast the religious earnestness of the mother with the skepticism of the son. He says: 'By the time Royce's education was completed, the main positions of the Puritan had been carried. The Bible could no longer be considered in the old literal sense the inspired word of Deity. The theology which rests on a magic book was in ruins,' and so forth. Josiah Royce expressed the temper of the new intellectual age; his mother in her narrative, loyalty to 'the old religion.' Royce himself was not so crude. His mother's experiences were to him poesy and imagination, touched with harmless self-deception. . . .

Professor Royce wrote about that fine trait 'loyalty.' His mother's transcontinental and troubled journey was an exhibition of a double loyalty — that of Christian loyalty to God and of God's loyalty to His people when in need. Professor Royce wrote of the 'beloved community.' His mother belonged to it. She was of Him 'of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named.' J. T. M.

The Influence of Anti-Christian Influences on Missions.—

Ernest Gordon in the *Sunday School Times* (May 11, 1946) points out that mission work flourishes only where churches remain loyal to Christ's command. He writes: "Missions can never be successfully developed without much prayer and great faith. When these are wanting, they fade into mere schoolteaching and futility. Furthermore, missions have a program which was given them by the Lord Himself. It has no limitation on time or extent. If this program is reduced to anything below the standard of 'every creature' and to the greatest immediacy, it shrivels. The professor of Missions in Union Seminary, Dr. Daniel J. Fleming, does not seem to realize this. His are worldly-wise plans. He writes of 'The World Task of the Church': 'Throughout the first two and a half decades of our period, missionary thought was under the influence of the slogan *The Evangelization of the World in this Generation*. Excessive efforts were made to enter every accessible field, and work was extended in many countries until it became excessively thin. About 1918 there began to be a reaction against this overextension. Surveys and reports of recent years recommend a more intensive policy and insist on the wisdom of quality rather than quantity in work. Increasing costs and lowered income have furthered this trend so that many societies have attempted to be less diffuse.' When the words of faith *The Evangelization of the World in this Generation* were accepted and acted on, missions flourished mightily. When they were laid aside, missions declined. Dr. Fleming continues: 'Contributions reached their maximum about 1920, beginning their decline well before the depression. . . . Instead of quite confidently planning policies on the basis of an indefinitely expanding budget, mission administrations have now had to face the possibility of a permanently reduced budget, since the capacity for giving on the part of the wealthy and those of moderate means is decreasing.' The date given coincides roughly with the control of seminaries and certain missionary societies by anti-Christian influences. Contributions then began their march into newer and evangelical missionary enterprises. Since then there has been an immense increment of missionary giving outside official church societies. This movement has both spiritual quality and missionary quantity. It aims at spreading the Gospel as widely and as quickly as possible, trusting the Holy Spirit to co-operate in deepening and intensifying the life of men and communities after their evangelization. It is Paul's method — 'striving to preach the Gospel where Christ has not been named.' It must be admitted that evangelical mission societies

at times have attempted too much and in consequence have done their work very superficially. But Modernism, with its stark unbelief and its outspoken appreciation of pagan religion, has definitely hurt the cause of missions. Infidels cannot be missionaries because they have no saving Christ to proclaim.

J. T. M.

Did the Roman Catholic Church Support Fascism? — Spokesmen of Roman Catholicism naturally deny that their Church or its head, the Pope, sanctioned Fascism. At Hartford, Conn., a meeting was held at which Roman Catholic speakers stated that their Church should not be accused of having supported or having been sympathetic toward Fascism. A report in the *Religious News Service* emanating from Hartford gives this account of the meeting:

"Charges that the Roman Catholic Church supported Fascism or was secretly allied to totalitarian forces while paying lip service to democracy were labeled false here by Dr. George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College, N. Y., at concluding sessions of a two-day conference of the Catholic Association for International Peace. Dr. Shuster, who is president of CAIP, spoke on 'The Contribution of the Church to Democracy in the World Crisis.'

"Declaring that the Catholic Church has sponsored a pattern of social values which can give genuine liberty and justice to the world, Dr. Shuster told the gathering of priests and laity that 'the whole of the Catholic effort must be understood as a mass movement which developed out of the contest with Liberalism and Marxism for the soul of the peoples.

"Though the goals of justice were important, something else — namely the Faith — was more important still, so that one might risk postponing the march toward the social objective for a while, or compromise on the means to attain it, if the religious purpose could thereby be served,' the Catholic educator said.

"The conference heard a plea for faith in the United Nations Organization by the Rev. Robert A. Graham, S. J., who attended the UN meetings in London. He said that although the UN has become 'a battlefield for ideologies,' it will produce results in the long run.

"'Impatience and pessimism are too prominent today,' Father Graham declared. 'The UN stands for peace, and we should not withdraw our loyalty when failures occur.' He praised Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's efforts in the assembly's defeat of Russian-backed proposals to repatriate forcibly all refugees.

"Dr. James M. Eagan of the College of New Rochelle, N. Y., deplored the 'great lack of leadership' on the part of the United States in the field of dependent or non-self-governing peoples. He warned that 'if we don't wake up and assume this leadership, Soviet Russia will' and said that the continuance of present policies will only 'make fertile ground for the spread of Communism.'

"The Rev. Basil Matthews, O. S. B., Trinidad-born Negro priest, declared that representation of West Indians in the Caribbean Com-

mission of the United Nations is 'not adequate' and also urged that the commission be 'converted not reconverted' from wartime purposes to peacetime aims." —

The verdict of history on the papal policy during the war will be awaited with interest. A.

The Two Issues Causing a Problem for Efforts at Union According to the *Christian Century*. — Concluding his series of articles on the question "Can Protestantism Win America?" Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of the *Christian Century*, submits the thirteenth and final article on the subject "Protestantism and the Lordship of Christ." Discussing this topic, he says, "I can think of only two sectarian features which offer even a momentary problem for Protestantism that is devoutly concerned to be ecumenical. One is the exclusive practice of baptism by immersion; the other the exclusive ordination of ministers within the historic episcopate. But the first can be easily reconciled in the ecumenical Church by the recognition of the full Christian status of those otherwise baptized and their acceptance by any local church without re-baptism. The second is really not so difficult as it has been made by the inflexible position of those on both sides. Protestantism in general has no convictions that inhibit its acceptance of the historic episcopate, for every denomination has its own shorter-lived and less impressive, but still historic, episcopate. By some such procedure as the so-called South India plan, the historic episcopate could, within a generation, become the position of an ecumenical Protestantism." The two points which Dr. Morrison mentions should indeed not cause much difficulty. But how about the real presence in the Lord's Supper, the substitutionary atonement of the Son of God, and of the doctrines that are pointed to by *sola gratia* and *sola fide*, not to mention *sola Scriptura*? He is looking at the scene from a very narrow point of view. A.

The Decline and Fall of Rauschenbusch Theology. — "Even one of his foremost disciples, Prof. J. W. Nixon of Rochester (writes the *Sunday School Times*, June 8, 1946), lecturing on the Rauschenbusch Foundation, is obliged to say: 'The phrase *social gospel* is still in decline and may never come back. Its work may be finished.' Dr. William Adams Brown wrote before his death: 'When Rauschenbusch comes to discussing remedies, his conclusions seem almost naively optimistic. . . . The high hopes entertained by the earlier advocates of the social gospel have been followed by later disillusionment. It is not simply that they have failed. What is worse is that, in the measure that they have succeeded, they have been disappointing.' Dr. McGiffert of the Chicago Divinity School, writing on *Walter Rauschenbusch Twenty Years After*, says his successors took over social vision minus the religious resources of the earlier day. They have discovered that service and reform cannot satisfy the deeper longings of the human heart. 'They are enrolling under any banner, whatever that promises to deal with, the personal problems of decision and destiny. . . .' Even

Kagawa (himself a liberal), when asked what message he would most like to give to American Christians, replied: 'First, we in Japan need prayer. Second, send us missionaries who will serve Christ; we cannot use a bunch of social workers. Third, send us Bibles and New Testaments in Japanese.' All of which goes to show that a Church without the spiritual Gospel of Christ is also void of any effective social gospel, the term here being used in its best sense.

J. T. M.

Catholic Priest Urges Protestants Not to Marry Catholics.—The Catholic priest in question lives in Chicago. He is editor of *Novena Notes*, national Catholic weekly published in Chicago. His name is Rev. Hugh Calkins, O.S.M. This is the report R. N. S. submits on his editorial:

"To non-Catholics thinking of marrying Catholics, we say, 'please don't,' Father Calkins stated in an editorial.

"Referring to the pledge a non-Catholic must make prior to the marriage, which requires that all children of the union be baptized as Catholics and brought up in the Catholic faith, Father Calkins said, 'If you are a devout non-Catholic, how can you in conscience swear to such promises?'

"The position of the Catholic Church, the priest explained, is tantamount to a declaration that, 'we don't dislike you, but we'd prefer that you didn't play in our yard. However, if you insist, you'll have to play our rules.'

"Accepting such a position and taking the oath means 'you are being disloyal to your non-Catholic beliefs,' he added.

"Church laws forbid most strictly mixed marriages. Not because we wish to antagonize other creeds, not to work hardships upon couples, but to safeguard the faith for Catholics. That faith is divinely precious and is lost very often by mixed marriages. Though you may not agree, you can see our point is sane."

Rome Opposing Dutch Unity Trade Union Movement.—The Roman Catholic hierarchy of Holland has issued a pastoral letter forbidding Catholics to become members of the new Unity Trade Union Movement because it is a 'Communist organization.' The letter was read in all Catholic churches throughout the country.

"The bishops also declared that the ban on Catholic membership in the N. V. V. (Dutch Trade Union Congress) and other Socialist organizations would be continued until the facts 'show that the aims and principles of such organizations are no longer in opposition to Christian beliefs and the Christian spirit.'

"It has become apparent,' the pastoral letter declared, 'that the Unity Trade Union is working under the guise of national unity in ways indisputably Communist. The clear-thinking part of the community has rejected it, and there can no longer be any doubt that Catholics may not be members of this Unity movement.'

"What we stipulated earlier about membership in Communist organizations now applies to membership in this trade union movement. Any Catholics who are members of this movement must be refused the Holy Sacrament.'

"Discussing the Catholic position toward the N. V. V. and Socialist groups generally, the Dutch bishops said:

"These organizations show a tendency to free themselves from Marxist principles and purely materialistic aims steadfastly condemned by the Church. Because of this, leaders of these organizations thought membership would no longer be forbidden to Catholics. Although we may not blind ourselves to this development in Socialist organizations, we must exercise care and keep to our former decision to forbid membership in these organizations."

"In the same vein, the bishops discouraged membership by Catholics in neutral and humanitarian organizations which are not founded on Christian principles.

"At the present time," they asserted, "we must reject these organizations if we are to build on a true foundation. Neutral organizations are not acceptable to Catholics. The rightful place of the Catholic is not in one of these organizations, but . . . as a member of an organization which is clearly governed by Christian principles."

"The bishops added, however, that Catholics may 'co-operate with humanitarian societies which, although not founded on Christian beliefs are striving for the upbuilding of a better communal life by working in the same direction as Catholics.'"—*Religious News Service*.

Brief Items.—President Truman has appointed a missionary educator to be the ambassador of the United States to China. It is Dr. J. Leighton Stuart, a Presbyterian, president of Yenching University of Peiping.

An editorial in the *Christian Century* of July 24 can hardly be read without bringing tears to one's eyes. It has the caption, "The Children Have Ceased to Cry." The editorial describes conditions in Europe, quoting reports. "All Vienna is hungry; the children have ceased to cry, for they know there is no food to still their hunger," says one account. What is true in Vienna undoubtedly is the case in many another province or section of central Europe.

That the removal of Nazism has not meant the elimination of the spirit of hatred, of murder, and of lustful power is shown by the recent pogrom in Poland, in which more than 40 Jews were killed. The scene of the frightful episode was Kielce.

Baptists lament the death of Dr. Curtis Lee Laws, who died in New York City, July 7, 1946, almost 78 years old. He was editor of the *Watchman-Examiner* from 1911 to 1938 and can be said to have served with distinction.

It is reported that in India the prohibition issue is playing an important role in public discussions. Prohibition is one of the fundamental aims of the Indian National Congress.

Plans have been made for a visit of Pastor Martin Niemoeller in this country. He is expected to arrive late in November,

accompanied by his wife. When the biennial meeting of the Federal Council of Churches will convene in Seattle, December 3-6, he is expected to be one of the speakers. The National Lutheran Council and Lutheran World Convention officials are among the parties seeking to provide speaking dates for him.

Philanthropic giving, so the press states, has experienced a general "upswing" this year. "New York gave \$94,160,497 during the first six months of this year, compared with \$45,080,558 in the first six months of 1945.

According to a report in the *Christian Beacon* a single missionary in China now would require \$180,000 Chinese a month and about \$20 in U. S. A. money a week just to live. Dr. Dodd [a Presbyterian missionary] paid \$26,000 just to get his luggage up from the customs house to his place of abode in Shanghai. Board costs \$5,000 a day. An orange would cost from \$500 to \$1,000. A haircut costs \$800, and \$860 in stamps were affixed to the letter which brought this news. The official exchange rate is \$2,000 Chinese to one American. [The daily press reports that this has been altered to about \$2,400 Chinese to one American.] In the black market \$12,000 to one could be obtained. [Wishing to adhere to the agreement made by our Government with the Chinese Government, we cannot avail ourselves of the advantages of the black market, which accounts for it that our mission in China at present is very expensive. — A.]

The Luther League of America (U. L. C. A.), at its fiftieth anniversary convention, inaugurated a campaign to raise \$25,000 by 1949 for mission work in British Guiana.

Brief Items from Religious News Service. — Investigation has shown that in areas of Kentucky and southern Indiana that were studied religious radio programs rank second in popularity. The response to them amounts to 21 per cent, and the only type of program that ranks higher (26 per cent) is the kind that features hillbilly music.

Protestantism has lost ground in France during the past 75 years, according to a study prepared by Pastor Roquette and published in the *Bulletin of French Protestantism*. This pastor states that there are at present 237,000 members of the Reformed Church as compared with 480,000 listed in the 1872 official census of Reformed Church members. His study does not include the 350,000 Lutherans in Alsace. In 1943 only 4,076 babies were baptized in the Reformed Church while 6,272 members died. Converts numbered only 283. Migrations from the country to towns has led to the closing of 125 parishes out of 650.

From Paris comes the news that across the flat, unshaded plain of Beauce, north of Chartres, a band of 30 English pilgrims are marching in the hot sun on their way to Vezelay to join pilgrims from 13 other nations taking part in an international crusade for peace. Since July 1 they have walked an average of 50 miles a day, carrying an 86-pound cross. The English pilgrims

are headed by a young Dominican priest from Oxford. The cross is to be set up on the site where St. Bernard preached his crusade 800 years ago. Shall one smile or weep?

At the Montreat, North Carolina, Leadership School the assertion was made that "young married couples and young people just out of college are the 'most unchurched' group in the nation." The next largest unchurched group is said to be that of very young children, who could be but are not attending church schools.

In 1830 over 80 per cent of the nation's population were farmers, while today the figure is about 20 per cent. Whoever tries to understand American life and the religious scene must take these conditions into consideration.

October 21-23 a national conference on the control of juvenile delinquency is to be held in Washington, D. C., according to an announcement of Attorney General Tom C. Clark. Five hundred delegates from all 48 States will participate.

The War Assets Administration in Washington, D. C., announces that preference will be given to religious groups in the purchase of government-owned chapels in this country and abroad. Those that wish to use chapels as shrines or memorials will be given first consideration. Second consideration will be given purchasers who will utilize them for religious purposes.

Around Milan, Italy, a strange kind of antireligious fanaticism is manifesting itself. From 14 Roman Catholic churches in Milan the "sacred host" was stolen. The thefts are attributed to agents of a secret society known as the "Devil's Prelate." The society is said to hold regular meetings in various Milan hotels, at which hosts are burned at the conclusion of a "black mass."

Dr. Hans Lilje, former secretary of the Lutheran World Convention, stated recently that there has been "an amazing response among German youth to religion and that they are avidly seeking religious guidance and example." In his home town of Hanover "fifteen to twenty thousand young people attended an open-air religious meeting, and many more were present at a subsequent gathering."

At an auction of English and foreign Bibles and New Testaments, a first-edition copy of John Eliot's Indian Bible, printed 1663 at Cambridge, Mass., was sold for \$4,200. A defective copy of Miles Coverdale's Version (of which no perfect copy exists) was sold for \$8,000. It was printed in 1535. A copy of the first edition of Thomas Cromwell's Great Bible, printed in 1539, brought \$5,200. An unpressed impression of the first issue of the first edition of the King James Version of 1611 with "he" instead of "she" reading in Ruth 3:15 (commonly known as the "He" Bible) also brought \$8,000.

The Office of Church World Service in New York, the joint Protestant relief agency, announces that it shipped overseas 868,600 pounds of food, clothes, and other supplies valued at \$328,000

during the month of June. The largest quantity of food to a single country—71 tons—went to Hungary to supplement the average daily diet of 800—900 calories per person. Three carloads of food and clothing were consigned to Poland. Other countries that received aid were Korea, Italy, France, Belgium, Holland, Austria, Germany, Greece, and China.

When on July 7 Mother Frances Xavier Cabrini was declared a saint, it was pointed out that her case is of unusual interest, because she is the first United States citizen canonized and because her canonization took place within the comparatively short space of thirty years following her death. If a person is to be canonized, he first has to be declared a Venerable and a Beatus. (Venerable is the title accorded to a "servant of God" whose cause for beatification has reached the stage where his heroic virtue or martyrdom has been proved, while the title of Beatus entitles the person to receive public veneration.) The process of canonization is very costly. Doctors are called to certify that the miracles proposed cannot be explained on scientific grounds. The case is debated by the postulator, who favors the canonization, and the promoter of the faith, whose task is to raise all sorts of objections ("the devil's advocate"). — Are any comments required?

In Marion, Ind., religion will be taught in the public schools. The plan was proposed by the Community Council of Weekday Religious Education and approved by representatives of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. According to the plan, an elective course will be available for senior high school students, and an elementary course will be offered to all fourth-grade pupils. The teachings will conform to state legislation, and no student will take the course without parental consent.

The Central District of the American Lutheran Church meeting in Millard, Nebr., tabled a resolution calling for "selective fellowship" between the American Lutheran Church, the United Lutheran Church, and the Missouri Synod.

Somewhere in the future is a world Church in which Christians of all faiths will be united, Methodist Bishop Ivan Lee Holt of St. Louis declared in Dallas, Texas. "I don't know how it will come about, but the need is so obvious that it cannot be helped," he asserted. The world Church which Bishop Holt envisions will unify Protestants and Catholics. "Not in my time or in the immediate future will we see a working world Church, but in some distant future, it will come," he declared. Bishop Holt, who is president of the Ecumenical Methodist Council, pointed out that there are 92 Protestant and Orthodox denominations bound together in the World Council of Churches, but with which Roman Catholics are not affiliated, and said that his dream is one in which all bodies will be united into one. The Bishop shortly will fly to England to help plan the next world conference of Methodists, which probably will convene in Oxford in 1947 or 1948.

A.